Twentieth Century Christianity

The Wheat and Tares

BY

DAVID MacCLEMENT ROWE

Class _____

Book _____

Copyright No. _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

Twentieth Century Christianity

THE WHEAT AND TARES

By

DAVID MacCLEMENT ROWE

1914

Press of
United Brethren Publishing Company
Dayton, Ohio

BT 78
.R7

Copyrighted, 1914, by
David MacClement Rowe
Dayton, Ohio

JAN -2 1915 $1.00

©Cl.A393060

201

Dedicated
To the cause of my
Lord and Savior,
Jesus Christ.

—D. W. Rowe.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Word of Appreciation	7
A Few Testimonials	9
Preface	13
Note	15
Comments on Unitarian Preachments	17
Abraham Lincoln's Religion	21
Unitarian and Scientific Theology	25
The Old, Old Story	38
What Is Christianity?	41
Is the Bible Genuine?	46
The Bible—Comments	52
What Is the Nature of God?	54
Is There a Personal Devil?	59
What Is Man's Relation to God?	65
What Is Spiritual Death?	72
Whence Comes Spiritual Life?	78
Is Christ Concealed in the Old Testament?	83
Is the Virgin Birth a Myth?	88
Did Christ Teach Social Service?	94
What Did Christ Teach Concerning Himself?	100
Is There a Holy Spirit?	105
Will There Be a Final Judgment?	110
Is Hell a Myth?	116
Is Christ's Resurrection a Myth?	124
Jesus' Teaching Concerning the Sabbath	134
Christ's Teaching Concerning Baptism	140
The Lord's Supper	146
Benediction	150

A WORD OF APPRECIATION

NEWSPAPER publishers are often criticized because they print so much sensational matter, give minute details to stories of crime and immorality, and give so little space to religious matter. It is also observed that many editorials are of a more or less irreligious or irreverent character.

Publishers usually contend that they give the public what the public demands of the newspapers. In others words, newspapers are published to sell. They contain what the publisher considers will help increase the circulation. Advertising rates depend on the circulation, and advertising space is what pays.

Another argument is: There is so much good being done all the time by so many people, that it is difficult to make newspaper stories of such matter sufficiently exciting to cause them to be read. Good is the rule rather than the exception, and for that reason crime stands out so prominently and attracts so much attention.

Again, newspapers are for all the people, regardless of their religious beliefs or unbeliefs, and publishers try to avoid antagonizing any considerable portion of the general public by advocating any certain religious views.

It is true, however, that newspapers exert a powerful influence on the public mind. To a very considerable extent they mould public opinion. They are active rather than passive factors relative to public opinion. It is an open question, therefore, whether this possible influence for good should be lost by simply catering to a morbid taste for excitement, or be exerted in assisting to educate the general public to a loftier plane of thought and thereby causing the newspapers to become a medium for reducing the amount of crime committed. For, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

When we find an exception to the general attitude of newspapers toward religious matter, it is fitting that it should be recognized. We take pleasure, therefore, in commending Mr. E. G. Burkam, president of the Dayton Journal Company, for his kindness in giving so much space in his paper to the publication of the fifteen articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity" which appeared in the *Dayton Journal* during the period from February seventeenth to July fourteenth, 1914. In publishing these articles, Mr. Burkam did a real good. They were widely read and commented on by *Journal* readers in all walks of life, which goes to prove that such matter is good "newspaper stuff." Mr. Burkam, we thank you.

Very truly,

D. M. Rowe.

A FEW TESTIMONIALS

The following letters are published here for the purpose of inspiring confidence in the matter contained in this book and not in the least for the commendation of the author.

From Dr. J. C. Massee, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Dayton, Ohio:

July 17, 1914.

MR. D. M. ROWE:

I have read a number of your recent articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity." It is my regret that any of them escaped me. I commend both the content, and the method of your defence of the "Old Book" and the "Old Faith." You have maintained a high standard throughout, and some of the articles, notably those on the Deity of Christ, the Judgment, the Holy Spirit, and the Resurrection, are among the strongest and freshest I have yet read. I wish, for the sake of many who would profit by these articles, that you would put them all together in book form.

Faithfully yours,

J. C. MASSEE.

From Dr. Maurice E. Wilson, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Dayton, Ohio:

July 20, 1914.

MR. D. M. ROWE:

I beg to express to you my appreciation of the series of articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity," which you have published from time to time in the *Journal*. These articles, I know, have been of much value and help to many readers, bringing to their attention in a clear, succinct, and forcible way, some of the fundamental truths of our faith—the faith held

by all the Evangelical churches in common as well as by the great Catholic churches, both Greek and Roman. Coming from a layman, these papers have attracted more attention than if they had emanated from a theologian or a minister. Your manner of presentation has been admirable all the way through.

Very sincerely yours,

MAURICE E. WILSON.

From Dr. Henry F. Colby, formerly pastor of the First Baptist Church, Dayton, Ohio, now retired:

August 14, 1914.

MR. D. M. ROWE:

I have read carefully all of your fifteen articles published in the *Dayton Journal.* Doubtless you could have filled a very much larger space with a subject so extensive in its nature, but I wish to say that, in my judgment, you have treated many of the great arguments in that line with thoughtfulness, fairness, and ability.

The articles ought to do good to any one who will carefully read them, and the Christian people of the city are under obligations to you for your courage, your study, and your skill in the treatment of this theme.

I am glad that you propose to publish them in a book, and I hope that it will have many readers. Thanking you, I remain, as always,

Yours fraternally,

HENRY F. COLBY.

From Dr. William A. Hale, pastor of the First Reformed Church, Dayton, Ohio:

August 25, 1914.

MR. D. M. ROWE:

I have read your articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity," appearing in the *Dayton Journal,* with great interest, and am sincere in saying they are strong, earnest, and convinc-

ing. I suggest that they be published in a more permanent form. Their merit deserves it. I hope you will see your way clear to give laymen the help these papers must need afford to honest thinkers. I congratulate you on your success.

Yours in Christ,

WILLIAM A. HALE.

From Dr. Charles A. Campbell, pastor of the Third Street Presbyterian Church, Dayton, Ohio:

November 11, 1914.

MR. D. M. ROWE:

I have been deeply interested in learning of the intention to gather into book form your newspaper articles on various themes of theology. During the course of their publication it was gratifying to hear from many sides words of approval and expressions of a sense of service rendered.

The Master said, "Every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." We need all angles of vision, all accents and inflections, and it is good for each man scribe of the kingdom to reveal the glory of his own peculiar treasure of faith.

The value of doctrine is undisputable, notably so if it augments the intellectual consciousness of spiritual realities.

The Word of God retains, I believe, the place of supreme spiritual authority. Its radiant truths are as potent as ever to illuminate and guide seeking souls to God. The revelation of Jesus stands unique, and unspeakably superior to all other words in purity, power, and promise, and he who chooses may demonstrate its credibility and divinity in his own heart by faith and obedience.

You have called attention to the outstanding assertions of the Book in a positive, simple, and intelligible fashion, and you have, I think, reflected the mind of the Spirit in your essays.

It would be a distinct gain if every Christian would make friends with these first-magnitude stars in the firmament of truth, which you have brought within the range of the vision of the average thinker on serious things.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. CAMPBELL.

PREFACE

FOR several years the writer has been impressed by the mass of unscriptural religious or semi-religious articles, news-stories, arguments, and so-called sermons which have appeared in newspapers and magazines. This class of religious matter has been given great prominence, probably because of its startling nature. On the other hand, there appears to have been comparatively little published, through these mediums, in refutation of these alleged modern religious ideas.

True enough, there have been many books published which deal with these erroneous teachings, but the general public does not read these books. The general public does read newspapers and magazines. The danger is apparent that the mind of the general public, feeding on these skeptical doctrines, might become alienated from the "old-time Religion."

Among the tainted religious doctrines promulgated to the general public, may be mentioned Russellism, Eddyism, Universalism, Unitarianism, Liberalism, Materialism, certain Higher Criticism, Socialism, and many other forms of error and modern Agnosticism, Skepticism, Infidelity, and Atheism.

It is evident that more must be done through popular print to reach the general public and set its mind right on the fundamentals of true Christianity. The writer was so imbued with this idea that he longed to do something in this direction, but felt unequal to the task. But, however much he lacked confidence in himself, or faith in God to use him for the purpose, he could not rid himself of the impulse to endeavor to do something. A certain Unitarian preacher had been in the habit of rushing into print with his destructive preachments. It has been his delight to ridicule the Christian church, Christian ministers, Christian people, and Christian ideals. In fine, his whole ambition has been to try to undermine the entire foundation of Christianity and to substitute therefor a man-made religion, built on ancient philosophies, scientific discoveries, and the teachings of such heathen deities as Confucius, Gautama

Buddha, Mohammed, and others, all of whom he places on an equality with Jesus Christ.

In his sarcastic treatment of the Christian religion, his teachings have been destructive throughout. He has offered absolutely nothing of a constructive character.

As the Christian ministry gave little or no attention, publicly, to his attacks, he became bolder and bolder, until in righteous indignation, the writer ventured a reply which was published in the *Dayton Journal,* January 27, 1914, and which is reprinted in this book.

No sooner had this edition of the *Journal* reached the breakfast tables in Dayton, than the writer received telephone calls thanking him for the article. He was stopped on the streets and men called at his office to commend him for the article. It seemed to strike the popular chord. Laymen and women, as well as ministers of all denominations, seemed to be highly pleased. Then it was suggested that this article should be followed up by a series of articles setting forth the fundamentals of Christianity. The writer decided to accept the task, realizing that God can do a lot with one man if the man be willing. The fifteen articles are the result.

As the articles appeared from time to time, it was suggested that they should be published in a permanent form, and this book is the result.

It was never the idea that these articles thoroughly cover any of the various themes. Hundreds of books have been written on almost all of them. It was the purpose merely to give in popular form some argumentative hints that might set the reader's mind to traveling along the right road, with the hope that the brief arguments might lead to a closer study of the Scriptures and other books that would be of assistance in opening up a better understanding of God's Word. A thorough understanding of the Bible is a bulwark against fads of peculiar religious ideas that "are like the grass which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven."

NOTE

IN the preparation of the articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity" and other matter contained in this book, the author is indebted to a great many writers and commentators for information, suggested thoughts, illustrations, and quotations. These helps from so many sources are so interwoven that it is next to impossible now to identify them, except in a few prominent instances already credited in the text.

We give below some of the sources of our help:

The Bible—Comparative scriptural references.

Dr. Henry Drummond—"Natural Law in the Spiritual World."

Flavius Josephus—Jewish history and dissertations.

Herbert Spencer—"First Principles—Biology."

Dr. Charles Darwin—"The Origin of Species."

Simon Greenleaf, LL.D.—"Testimony of the Evangelists."

Edward I. Bosworth—"Inductive Studies—Teachings of Jesus and His Disciples."

Dr. Daniel Shepardson—Sermons.

John Milton—"Paradise Lost."

Dante Alighieri—"The Divine Comedy."

Johann W. von Goethe—"Faust."

Lord Francis Bacon—Essays, "Death," "Atheism," etc.

Victor Hugo—"Les Miserables."

Miscellaneous others: Shakespeare, Dickens, MacLaren, Geikie, Peloubet, Farrar, etc.

NOTE—The following article, previously referred to, led to the writing of the fifteen articles on "Twentieth Century Christianity." From the *Dayton Journal,* Tuesday, January 27, 1914.

COMMENTS ON UNITARIAN PREACHMENTS

FOR some time, a certain minister has been flaunting glaring advertisements of Unitarianism. He has been diligent in getting his preachments into the public press. The writer is now impressed that a few comments may be apropos.

While the orthodox Christian church holds up the Cross and appeals to men to worship God through his Son, Jesus Christ, this minister holds up the bones of departed American citizens and cries out, "Behold these relics of the Unitarian Church!" But even in that, he compromises the truth. Recently he published the portraits of seven men claimed to be Unitarians. Of these we concede him Eliot, Emerson, and Jefferson. What of the others? Lowell was more probably either a Congregationalist or a member of the Church of England, as were other members of the Lowell family. It is not known that *Lincoln ever attached himself to any particular church, but from his various utterances and his attitude toward prayer, it is evident that he believed in Christ as a mediator and a Savior. Hale was a member of the Congregational Church of Boston. Was Longfellow a Unitarian? Would a Unitarian poet translate and publish the following?

From the Spanish:

"Hear, Shepherd; thou who for thy flock art dying,
O wash away these scarlet sins, for thou
Rejoicest at the contrite sinner's vow.
O wait; to thee my weary soul is crying—
Wait for me: Yet why ask it, when I see,
With feet nailed to the cross, thou 'rt waiting still for me."

---

*See sketch, "Lincoln's Religion."

Or the following, from "God's Acre":

"Into its furrows shall we all be cast,
In the sure faith that we shall rise again
At the great harvest; when the Archangel's blast
Shall winnow like a fan, the chaff and grain."

A WEAK ARGUMENT

But is it not a weak argument to ask a man to believe a doctrine simply because another man believed it, even though the inference be that the other man was more intellectual or greater than the one sought? That is to suppress the will, to stifle the intellect and enthrall the soul. How many newspaper pages could be filled with the portraits of great men who have lived and died in the true Christian faith, and of those who to-day are as firmly as ever anchored to it? But the Christian church points to but One, Jesus Christ, the Author and Finisher of our faith, the only perfect Man.

VARIETY OF BELIEFS

But the Unitarian Church is a sect of many shades of belief. It is largely a matter of individual opinion among its members as to what should or should not be accepted from the Bible. One member of the Dayton church told me she believes in the transmigration of souls. Probably she is the only one who accepts that old heathen doctrine. After preaching four years at the Middlesex Association (Unitarian), Emerson resigned because his congregation differed with him in respect to the Lord's Supper.

Emerson did not believe in consistency. He said, "Speak what you think to-day, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks though it contradict everything you said to-day."

From the published philosophical dissertations of this preacher, the foregoing seems to be his policy. The Unitarian Church of Dayton will likely think much as its leader thinks.

One thing he professes to think is, that no intelligent man today believes otherwise than as he believes. Statistics show that in the United States there are twenty millions of orthodox believers in the principal Protestant denominations. There are seventy thousand Unitarians. Think of it! Seventy thousand intelligent beings in the United States against twenty millions of ignorant, superstitious believers in worn-out legends! A terrible condition of affairs!

MORE EFFUSIONS

This Unitarian slaps his chest and says: "I am not a coward. I am a red-blooded man and I do not need a Savior. I will be my own savior." Say, what becomes of all that red blood when the funeral dirge is sounded?

Then he asks, "From what am I to be saved?" He scoffs at being termed a lost soul. Then he talks about every man being his neighbor's savior. But what is the need of so many saviors if no one is to be saved from anything? On the other hand, it is as one drowning man depending on another drowning man to save him. In fact, taking his effusions through and through, they appear full of vagarious rot. He speaks of the Bible as being one of the great books of the world; then in the next breath he says it is full of lies and absurdities. He speaks of the Christ spirit, and of emulating Christ as a standard of morality, and in the next breath he makes Christ appear as the greatest liar, blasphemer, and imposter that ever lived. He gives the same weight to the sayings of ancient heathen men and women as to the teachings of Christ. He digs up old, worn-out philosophies and presents them as modern thought. He worships at the throne of Materialism, that mirage of the Great Reality. He denies the miraculous because, forsooth, it does not line up with the convolutions of his own wonderful brain. He has discovered by astronomical observations that heaven is not and cannot be up. Wonderful, wonderful! He says our children have the right to know and be taught the best;

he is the best; therefore, send our children to him and extract them from the twenty millions of ignoramuses. The great inducement—he talks in the Sunday school. The Primary Department will be taught—How God made Dinosaurs. The Cradle-Roll Department will be told how long it takes God to do things. By all means, children should know these things while they are young and innocent. We have in our midst one who knows God's limitations and his value of time.

After all, what is there in these theories that will satisfy a dying man? What does he offer to convert a Jean Valjean into a Madeleine? Tell such a character to grasp his bootstraps and jerk himself out of a slough of crime, and see what wonderful results you get! Go into the sub-stratum of society —go where, as Victor Hugo says, "the earth leaves off and the mire begins," there preach philosophy and materialism to the down-and-outs and see their faces beam with the joy of a new light bursting in upon their souls.

A bas. "Fowls cackle, asses bray, and philosophers spin false reasons." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Know ye not that these things are spiritually discerned?"

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S RELIGION

OWING to the oft-reiterated assertions of certain Unitarians that Abraham Lincoln was a Unitarian, it is proper here to say a further word on that subject. However, the fact that any man or number of men, regardless of their prominence or intelligence, supported a certain religious doctrine, is not of itself an evidence of the authenticity of that doctrine.

First, there is no record to show that Lincoln ever entered a Unitarian church or attended a Unitarian service. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that during his residence in Springfield, Illinois, Lincoln was a regular attendant at the First Presbyterian Church. Also during his residence in Washington, Lincoln regularly attended services at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where his pew is still preserved and bears a silver plate designating it as Lincoln's pew. None but very prominent people are ever allowed to occupy it.

While Lincoln was naturally of a religious disposition, yet in his early life his religion was more of an intellectual interest than of a spiritual character. It is also admitted that at the age of twenty-five, owing, perhaps, to "interpretations of Biblical precepts of the more or less illiterate church of the West," Lincoln revolted against the Christian system, and even prepared a pamphlet against it, which was afterwards destroyed, yet this period of doubt lasted for but a short time. He never joined any religious sect, but always had a deep reverence for the Bible and the church, and was a regular attendant upon religious services. His literary style and moral point of view were both formed by the Bible.

When death came into his family, what do we find? That is always a test. When his son Willie was sick, Mr. Lincoln was constantly at his bedside, watching and praying. When

the boy died, Lincoln, already weighed down with the affairs of the Government, was then crushed with grief. For the first time in his life, Lincoln was driven to look outside of his own mind and heart for help to endure his sorrow. It was then that he turned to the Christian religion for consolation. Whatever Lincoln's previous attitude may have been toward the Christian faith, it certainly was his source of comfort after his son's death; for from that time on he was often found studying his Bible and bowing in prayer. But even prior to that time there is sufficient evidence that Lincoln revered the Christian faith. We find that evidence all through his public utterances and state papers. In his first inaugural address, President Lincoln said the difficulty between the North and South could be adjusted in the best way by "intelligence, patriotism, CHRISTIANITY, and a firm reliance on Him who has never forsaken this favored land."

That Lincoln believed in the justice and judgments of God is evident from many of his utterances in connection with the war. We give one example; there are others. In his proclamation for a National Fast Day, August, 1861, he said:

"WHEREAS, it is fit and becoming in all people, at all times, to acknowledge and revere the Supreme Government of God; to bow in humble submission to His *chastisements;* to confess and deplore their sins and transgressions, in the full conviction that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and to pray with all fervency and contrition for the *pardon of their past offences,* and for a blessing upon their present and prospective action; and,

"WHEREAS, when our own beloved country, once, by the blessing of God, was united, and prosperous and happy, is now afflicted with faction and civil war, it is peculiarly fit for us to recognize the *hand of God in this terrible visitation,* and in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation, and as individuals, to humble ourselves before Him, and pray for His mercy, to pray that we *may be spared further punishment,* though justly deserved;" etc.

This does not sound much like the Unitarian doctrine of self-dependence and evolution, by personal effort, from moral depravity to the highest moral rectitude; nor like their teaching that God has no hand in the great affliction of nations when they ignore His will as taught in the Old Testament.

Lincoln's attitude toward the Holy Spirit is clearly established by his Proclamation for a Day of Thanksgiving to God for hearing "the supplications and prayers of an afflicted people and to vouchsafe to the Army and Navy of the United States victories on land and sea," etc. This proclamation, issued July 15, 1863, set aside for the above purpose Thursday, August 6, 1863. The second paragraph reads, "Now, therefore, be it known that I do set apart Thursday, the 6th day of August next, to be observed as a day for national thanksgiving, praise, and prayer, and I invite the people of the United States to assemble on that occasion in their customary places of worship and in the forms approved by their own consciences, render homage due to the Divine Majesty for the wonderful things He has done in the Nation's behalf, and invoke the influence of His Holy Spirit to subdue the anger which has produced so long-sustained a needless and cruel rebellion, to change the hearts of the insurgents, to guide the counsels of the Government with wisdom adequate to so great a national emergency, and to visit with tender care and consolation throughout the length and breadth of our land, all those who, through vicissitudes of marches, voyages, battles, and sieges, have been brought to suffer in mind, body, or estate, and finally to lead the whole nation through the paths of repentance and submission to the Divine Will, back to the perfect enjoyment of Union and fraternal peace."

In this we find a clear statement of the power and office of the Holy Spirit, as defined by Christ, namely, to influence, to subdue, to change hearts, to guide, to visit and console, to lead to repentance and submission to the Divine Will. This is anything but Unitarianism, which denies the existence of a Holy Spirit.

As to Lincoln's personal convictions, he once said publicly, "I am deeply concerned to know, not whether the Lord is on my side, but whether I am on the Lord's side." This shows his deep desire to submit his will to the Lord's will, rather than to endeavor to bring the Lord over to any peculiar religious ideas of his own invention.

References: Tarbell's "Life of Lincoln," and "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," compiled by Hon. James D. Richardson.

UNITARIANISM AND SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY

IN order that the readers of the articles in this book, who have never investigated Unitarianism and Scientific Theology, may thoroughly understand the references we make to this class of religious thought, the product of some of our universities, we present here a brief sketch of the history of Unitarianism and its doctrines to which are allied certain Materialistic doctrines born of Modern Knowledge.

UNITARIANISM

Any one who has read the New Testament knows that the deity of Christ is the main argument. Christ's whole effort was to establish his Messiahship and in that connection to portray and exemplify the Father and to define the office of the Holy Spirit. It was Christ who taught the Triune God. The Trinity was not understood in the Old Testament dispensation. Even the purpose of the Messiah, who was devoutly looked for, was not understood, for the Jews expected in him a temporal deliverer.

Because Christ did not come as a temporal deliverer, the Jews did not accept him; and because he constantly rebuked the Jewish hierarchy, that body sought his death—which was finally brought about by his claim to be the Son of God and one with God.

It is not erroneous, we believe, to say that Unitarianism really started with the Sanhedrin, although perhaps it is not customary to date it that far back. We do not refer to the name but to the belief of the sect. At any rate, the denial of the deity of Christ, which started with the Sanhedrin, has never really ceased, as a theological doctrine, to have its followers.

Discussions on the deity of Christ were simultaneous with the earliest speculations on the Logos. Toward the close of the second century, Theodotus and Artemon founded schools in

Rome. About the same time Beryllus and Praxeas also taught in Rome, and Noëtus in Smyrna. In the third century, Sabellius announced his doctrine. Arianism originated in the fourth century, and was the parent of Socinianism, from which the later Unitarianism sprang. All of these teachers held to the belief in the indivisible unity. In other words, they dissented from the Trinitarian tenet.

About the time of the Reformation, Ludwig Hetzer, Johann Denk, and Sebastian Frank in Germany, and Claudius in Switzerland, preached monotheism and the simple humanity of Christ. In the sixteenth century, Unitarianism was disseminated in Holland and France, and later in Poland, Transylvania, Prussia, and Silesia. But toward the close of the seventeenth century, Unitarians in Europe, as a body, were known only in Transylvania.

Traces of Unitarianism were found in England coeval with the Reformation. Dr. Owen states that the denial of the divinity of Christ was common throughout England in 1655. Before the close of the seventeenth century, Unitarians had places of worship in London. In 1825, the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was founded in London.

From the first settlement of the New England colonies, there were modifications of the Puritanic creed. In 1785, the congregation of King's Chapel, Boston, eliminated Trinitarianism and the direct worship of Christ from the "Book of Common Prayer." In 1815, a controversy between Dr. Channing and Dr. Worcester resulted in the separation of the Unitarians from the Congregationalists, and the establishment of a sect. The ministers of a large number of Congregational churches, of Boston and throughout Massachusetts, with their flocks joined the movement. Harvard College was in their hands and remains so to-day. In 1825, the American Unitarian Association was organized in Boston. It holds biennial gatherings under the name "National Conference of Unitarians and other Christian churches."

Going back to the origin of Unitarianism, we find that its parent was Socinianism and its grandparent was Arianism.

Arianism was founded by Arius, a presbyter at Alexandria. Arius asserted that "there was a time when the Son was not coequal, since the Father who begot must be before the Son who was begotten and the latter therefore could not be eternal." Many prominent bishops sided with Arius and the most acute intellects of the church discussed the question. The general council of Nice, 325 A.D., attended by three hundred bishops, condemned Arius and declared the Son to be consubstantial with the Father. When Constantius, the son of Constantine, became sole ruler of the Roman Empire after the death of his brothers, Constantine and Constans, he supported the Arian decrees and Arianism became successful after a long controversy.

The sect now became divided between strict and moderate Arians. Eusebius, of Cæsarea, declared the Son to be similar in substance to the Father, and his followers were known as Semi-Arians. The prominent leaders of the Strict Arians maintained that the Son was dissimilar to God, of different essence and created out of nothing. Several attempts were made to heal these divisions, but the confusion became greater than ever. During all this controversy, first one party, then the other, was in the ascendency until the death of Constantius in 361. On the accession of Julian the Apostate, the Nicene party re-established themselves in Egypt, Gaul, Spain, and Greece, and later throughout the western countries. Although crushed out in the Roman Empire, Arianism for several centuries remained the religion of the Germanic tribes, but later gave place to the Catholic Church. In 744, Arianism as a sect became extinct. It often reappeared as a theological opinion.

Socinianism was founded by Socinus, an Italian theologian, about 1574. He maintained that the Trinity was a pagan doctrine; that Christ was a created and inferior being. He denied the personality of the devil, the native and total depravity of

man, the vicarious atonement, and the eternity of punishment. His theory was that Christ was a man divinely commissioned, who had no existence before his conception by the Virgin Mary, that human sin was the imitation of Adam's sin, and that human salvation was the imitation and adoption of Christ's virtue; that the Bible was to be interpreted by human reason, and that its metaphors were not to be taken literally. The opinions of Socinus are still held by some churches in Holland, Switzerland, Great Britain, and the United States under the name Unitarian.

But the acceptance of these doctrines among Unitarians varies according to the views of individuals. Some Unitarians accept the doctrine of the fall, but deny that its consequences destroy the innate rectitude of human nature. As to the atonement, Unitarian opinion ranges from a modification of the redeeming office of a Savior to the belief that Christ's mission was solely that of a teacher and exemplar. Some Unitarians regard the Gospel as designed by the Deity for the redemption of a fallen race; others as a recognition of natural religion, with precepts, truths, laws, motives, and hopes, exalting individual responsibility in character and life.

From the foregoing we see that the Unitarian doctrine is purely the result of human speculation rather than of divine revelation. It depends for its existence on human reason and philosophy, rather than on the inspired record of Christ's own teachings. It is not of modern origin nor the fruit of modern knowledge as some of its leaders of to-day would have us believe. It has had the benefit of time, intelligence, wealth, refinement and influence, and yet to-day it is without any extensive force. Probably at no time in its history was Unitarianism weaker than to-day. In its early history, at times, it was opposed by ecclesiastic and civil power, but at other times it was supported. At no time did it suffer more than has the true Christian church, yet the Evangelical church has grown steadily in power and influence

Christ said, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life." That is what the Unitarian Church lacks—the life-giving power of Jesus Christ. Therefore it is dead while it lives.

But the Unitarian Church of to-day undoubtedly ventures beyond the doctrinal limits of Doctor Channing, its first prominent leader in America, if we may judge from its present exponents. For Doctor Channing was intimately associated with Dr. Samuel Hopkins, a disciple of Jonathan Edwards, and when he was approved for the ministry in 1802, it was supposed that he would enlist on the side of extreme orthodoxy, although he stated later that even at that time he was an Arian but favored many of the opinions of Doctor Hopkins. But when the Congregational Church split into "liberal" and "orthodox" parties, Doctor Channing became the acknowledged head of the "liberal" or Unitarian party. He was opposed to Calvinism and the Trinitarian doctrine. But his system of views was complex and generally considered discordant. These difficulties were covered to some extent by his "charms of imagination and sentiments, linked with schemes of moral and social reform." Doctor Channing would scarcely venture into the depths of skeptical thought which some of the Unitarian leaders of to-day dare to do. In fact, to-day, Science seems to have supplanted the Bible in the Unitarian mind, and the Scientific or Natural theologians appear to have the right of way in the Unitarian Church. These theologians are trying to undermine the old faith and to build up a new religion based on new discoveries of natural laws, creative forces, evolution, and previously unknown elements.

SCIENTIFIC OR NATURAL THEOLOGY

Now, our quarrel with the Scientific Theologian is based on five propositions:

First, he misunderstands, misinterprets or misrepresents the Biblical statements.

Second, he identifies Christianity with man-made creeds rather than with the life and original teachings of Jesus.

Third, he places the religious emphasis on the practical and social basis rather than on the Spiritual, and does not seem to understand that the practical and social application of religion is the spontaneous expression of the true fundamental reality—the inward Spiritual life.

Fourth, he insists on confining religious truth to the test of material investigation.

Fifth, because of his lack of Spiritual experience and of his misunderstanding of Scripture, he is not always able to associate his Scientific knowledge in proper relation to his religious misconceptions, he at once discredits the Bible and the whole Christian system.

One of the first things that the Natural theologian does, is to criticise the Biblical history of the creation. He starts off with the fact that Science has revealed the origin of the world to date back millions of years and that the great antiquity of man has been established beyond a doubt. As though this discovery antagonizes the Biblical story! This is a common error among this class of theologians. They overlook the fact that Revelation does not specify a definite time when the creation took place. Revelation confines itself to a simple general statement—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Millions or even billions of years might be involved in that statement—"In the beginning." The argument hinges on how far back this period dates. There was a beginning, and it was in the beginning that God created the heavens and the earth. There was a period following the point of beginning when creation was in a chaotic condition. Then God evolved order out of the confused mass, and step by step completed his work as outlined in the first and second chapters of Genesis, and there have never been any discoveries to show that Genesis is incorrect in the order of succession. It is a natural and reasonable order of succession. But it is an erroneous idea that

the Scriptures teach that the creation took place four thousand or five thousand years before Christ. There are no fixed dates in the Old Testament. The marginal dates usually shown have been arranged by calculating back from the known dates of certain events in later history. There is no certain chronology prior to the time of Abraham.

The Scientist says: "Belief in God was largely founded on a view of the world which meant the direct intervention of God in creation and the possibility of constant miracle. Modern Science, and especially the work of Darwin, has shifted the whole ground of proof, and religion to-day never dreams of staking all on the supernatural interposition of God. The presupposition on which Science builds, is the law of Continuity. It will not give that up, because only by it can Science do its work. The old explanation of a mysterious thing as due to God's interfering with the laws of the universe, is to Science the one incredible thing. It will try any and every explanation before that and, even if all fail, will not accept that. Science does not deny the mystery. What it denies is the explanation of it as the suspension of law. It tries to account for the miracle; and if it fails, lays it aside as something yet to be brought within the sweep of Natural law and one day explained."

By this statement, we must conclude that, although believing that God established the Natural order of the universe, we must accept as a fact that the laws of Nature have become greater than the Supreme Being who established them. They are now beyond his control. They are outside his jurisdiction. It is admitted that pre-supposed Natural laws in certain instances have not prevented phenomena to appear contrary to previous experience, yet such miracles must not be accounted for as a peculiar act of God. It must be assumed that there will sometime be discovered an explanation within the realm of Natural law. The law of Continuity cannot be admitted to be subject to the will of God.

Can a true believer in the God of revelation accept that as a fact? Can he thus accept the denial of the omnipotence of God? We think not. At least, he must say to the scientist, "Thus far you may go but no farther."

We do not claim that in respect to purely material things, God wills to disorganize the universe at any time, nor do we suppose that he has actually suspended the law of Continuity. But we claim that God rules in the universe and that he can overrule matter at any time in order to reveal or demonstrate his presence and will to mankind. And we insist that in applying the test of Natural law to Spiritual matters, Scientists must not overlook the fact that, even in the Material world, Natural laws are overruled, and we contend that what can take place in the Natural world can also take place in the Spiritual realm in respect to these same laws.

The law of gravity does not prevent the plant from growing upward from the earth. Gravitation has not been suspended, but Vitality overrules it. We do not find the law of Vitality in the stone. This law does not apply to the Inorganic world. To that extent it discontinues. The fact is, each Natural kingdom has its own set of laws which continue throughout that kingdom but not beyond it. Biological laws are continuous where there is life, just as Gravitation continues where there is matter, and Spiritual laws continue where there is Spiritual life—or, agreeing with Doctor Drummond, Spiritual laws are not analogous but are actually the same laws which govern the Natural realm applied under comparative conditions. But "laws are only modes of operation—not themselves operators." Laws have neither substance nor energy.

While the Scientist flounders around seeking from Nature an explanation of the miracle, the Christian turns to God. The Scientist cannot explain the germinating life of the seed. He knows the process. He knows the result. But the life he cannot define. All life is a miracle. The Scientist cannot put

life into a dead seed. Life, vegetable or animal, Natural or Spiritual, is of God alone.

The Scientist says, "A statement or proposition is true when it agrees with the facts confirmed by experience." And he says, "It does not follow that an experience is false if it is not corroborated by every one we meet." He makes an allowance for the difference of capacity in different individuals. He says: "We pay no heed to the judgment of a blind man on questions of color, or of a stone-deaf man on music. Perhaps only one man out of a dozen will hear the shrill squeak of a bat. A majority of eleven to one will not—or should not—convince the minority of one that he has heard no sound."

Now, we want to press home that argument to the Scientist on the question of Spiritual life. Because he, living only in the Natural realm, has no capacity for knowledge of the Spiritual realm, is no evidence that there is no Spiritual realm, nor that there is no such thing as Spiritual experience on the part of one who claims to have received Spiritual life.

The Scientist says, "Science deals with what has been and is: religion deals with what is to be." In regard to religion, the Scientist is wrong again. We claim that the Christian religion also deals with what has been and is, as well as with what is to be. Christianity deals with Spiritual life and that has existed since before the world was created, and emphatically since man was created, and it will exist throughout eternity. The Christian religion deals with God's relation to man and man's relation to God, and is based on historical facts—revelation and experience past and present, and a faith in things to come.

The Scientist says, "You cannot explain a picture by the chemistry of colors." No. Neither can you explain Spiritual experience by Scientific calculations or Philosophic deductions.

The Scientist says: "To-day practically no one will attempt either to defend or deny the proofs of God and religion that used to be offered. We neither accept them nor refute them;

but simply ignore them. They are dead issues, because the whole world has swung away from them. There is a modern point of view which gets its work in with all of us more or less."

Here we see the effort of the Scientist to drag religious thought into the great whirl of change taking place in Scientific thought. He cries, *"Evolution! Evolution!"* New ideas are being evolved in every branch of science, and so he claims that religion must get in the swing of change and accept modern views based on modern discoveries. And so the Unitarian bolsters up his doctrines on the cry from the universities which demands that religion be made over to meet advanced thought in things material. Modern religion, therefore, must expunge all belief in the miraculous which cannot be accounted for by Natural laws. Religion must be tested by Natural reason. But the acid test of religion is Vitality, and the backbone of religion is Stability. Without Vitality and Stability, religion lacks force and inspires no confidence. Experience proves Natural religion to be dead, but Spiritual religion to have Life abundantly, which is as a fountain of joy springing up into an ever-increasing faith. Creeds, the invention of man, have changed, but the fundamentals of the Christian religion derived from the inspired Word of God, have never changed and never will change.

"Nature is mute: we question her in vain,
And feel that God alone can make all plain.
None other can expound his mysteries,
Console the feeble, and illuminate the wise.
Left guideless everywhere, no way is seen.
Man seeks in vain some reed upon which to lean."

—*Voltaire.*

Some statements taken from a sermon by Dr. Minot Judson Savage, delivered in the Church of the Messiah, New York, November, 1897, show that certain Unitarian sermons published recently as new thoughts are merely rehashes of former utterances.

Doctor Savage said: "I propose to try to make clear what it is that the world has lost as the result of the advance of modern knowledge, and what, if anything, it has gained.

"It is modern knowledge, increasing knowledge, larger, clearer light, that takes away the old beliefs. But if these old beliefs are not true, it simply means that we are discovering what is true—that is, having a clearer view and vision of God's ways and methods of governing the world.

"First: Modern knowledge has taken away the old universe. That is, that little, tiny, playhouse affair, not so large as our solar system, which, in the first chapter of Genesis, God is reported to have made—as a carpenter working from the outside makes a house—inside of six days. That little universe of Genesis is absolutely gone."

But Doctor Savage does not say where it has gone, nor what he has discovered that is not covered by that statement in Genesis, "The heavens and the earth were finished and *all the host of them.*"

"Secondly: The God of the Old Testament and the God of most of the creeds has been taken away. That God who let the good little world that he made, slip out of his control into the hands of the devil, etc.

"Thirdly: The story of Eden, the creation of man, and then immediately the fall of man, and the resulting doctrine of total depravity—this has been taken away.

"Then the old theory of the Bible has been taken away. The theory that makes it a book without error or flaw, and makes us under obligation to receive all its teachings as the veritable word of God, though they seem hideous, blasphemous, immoral, degrading, or not—this is gone.

"Then, in the next place, the blood of atonement is gone. That means that the Eternal Father either will not or cannot receive back to his heart his own erring, mistaken, wandering children unless the only begotten Son of God is slaughtered,

and we are plunged beneath the ocean of blood—that has been taken away.

"Belief in the devil has been taken away.

"Belief in endless punishment has been taken away."

These are the things that have been taken away, says Doctor Savage. So say all of the Unitarian champions and the Scientific Theologians to-day. Like so much rubbish they have been thrown to the ash-man and carted away to the dump. Mr. Modern Knowledge has cleaned the theological house. With a wave of the hand he has closed the argument, and the Unitarian and Scientific Theologian, themselves, have decided that they have won their case. Can we imagine a court of chancery hearing only the plaintiff and then deciding against the defendant? We think not. In this case the defendant objects to a decision rendered solely by the plaintiff.

Christianity is a warfare against the world and the devil. The church of Christ is militant on earth and will be triumphant in heaven.

"Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain. (I. Cor. 3: 18, 20.)

And so we submit the following arguments as our mite in the militant work being done so much more ably by others, and may they be of some help to you, dear Reader.

Very truly,

D. M. Rowe.

"The world is a scene of changes; to be constant in nature were inconstancy."

—*Cowley.*

"The world is still deceived with ornament.
In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt
But, being seasoned with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil? In religion,
What damnéd error, but some sober brow
Will bless it and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?

. . . . .

The seeming truth which cunning times put on
To entrap the wisest."

—*Bassanio, in "Merchant of Venice," Shakespeare.*

"It is true that a little philosophy inclineth a man's mind to atheism, but depth of philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

"The laws of nature are but the ways in which the great, almighty Lawgiver operates; they have no efficiency except as channels of his will; rightly understood they cannot but be seen to agree with his written Word."

—*Tryon Edwards.*

"The laws of nature are not, as some modern naturalists seem to suppose, iron chains by which the living God, so to say, is bound hand and foot; but elastic cords, rather, which he can lengthen or shorten at his sovereign will."

—*Philip Schaff.*

THE OLD, OLD STORY

I love to tell the story
Of unseen things above,
Of Jesus and his glory,
Of Jesus and his love;
I love to tell the story,
Because I know it 's true;
It satisfies my longings
As nothing else will do.

I love to tell the story;
More wonderful it seems
Than all the golden fancies
Of all our golden dreams.
I love to tell the story;
It did so much for me;
And that is just the reason
I tell it now to thee.

I love to tell the story;
'T is pleasant to repeat
What seems each time I tell it
More wonderfully sweet.
I love to tell the story,
For some have never heard
The message of salvation
From God's own Holy Word.

I love to tell the story;
For those who know it best
Seem hungering and thirsting
To hear it like the rest.
And when, in scenes of glory,
I sing the new, new song,
'T will be—the Old, Old Story
That I have loved so long.

TWENTIETH CENTURY CHRISTIANITY
WHEAT AND TARES

By

D. M. Rowe

Article One

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

MUCH is being said and written at present on the subject of twentieth century Christianity and the Christianity of the future, most of which is along heterodox lines. The writer feels it a duty and a privilege in this article and some future articles, to attempt some words along orthodox lines of thought. In this attempt, if we succeed in gathering up from many sources, convictions and impressions, and in cencentrating them in one focus and expressing them, we shall feel satisfied.

First, then, what is Christianity? It is defined as the religion of Christians—the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ. Then what does the title "Christ" signify? It is defined "the Anointed One," synonymous with the Hebrew, "Messiah." Next, as constant reference is made to "the church," what do we understand by "the church"?

The church is simply organized Christianity, the physical representation on earth of the kingdom of God. The term in its broad sense does not refer to denominations. The early church knew nothing of denominations; these are the inventions of man. Orthodox churches are merely groups of Christians. Certain denominations are merely groups of Christians who emphasize particular ordinances or customs, and, in the main, the principal difference is in regard to organization. Almost without exception, all orthodox denominations agree on the essentials, namely: belief in the Bible as the inspired Word of God; in God as the Creator and Father of us all; in the deity of Christ; in the virgin birth; in the teachings and miracles of Christ; in his death, resurrection, and ascension, and that he ever liveth to make intercession for us; that in his name only must we be saved from perdition, and that through repentance,

acceptance, and baptism; belief in the Holy Spirit as the third person in the Trinity; in a personal devil; in heaven, and hell; and a final judgment for all.

Christians believe in the mercy of God, but they also believe in the justice of God. They believe in man as a free moral agent. He has the power and freedom to reject God and his Son, Jesus Christ. Likewise, he has the power and freedom to accept. Inasmuch as the Scriptures clearly teach that we can only approach God through his Son, Jesus Christ, when one accepts he becomes a Christian, namely, a believer in and a follower of Christ.

All of the above essentials are clearly taught by Paul in his epistles and were undoubtedly the creed of the early church as they are of the church of to-day.

TWENTIETH CENTURY CHRISTIANITY

What, then, is so-called twentieth century Christianity? It is nothing more than first century Christianity, for God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. God does not change. God's laws do not change. They were perfect in the beginning, and perfection cannot improve. Man changes. Science and philosophy change. There was a science and a philosophy of the dark ages; there was a science and a philosophy of the middle ages; there is a science and a philosophy of the twentieth century; and there will be a science and a philosophy of the future. But the same scientific and philosophic laws existed in the dark ages as exist to-day, only man had not discovered them. They have been revealed to him gradually. The laws are God's laws; the discoveries are man's through God's revelations.

But increased knowledge may work harm as well as good. Festus said to Paul, "Much learning doth make thee mad." This was not true of Paul, but it does seem to be true of some twentieth century scientists and philosophers. They manage to string the whole alphabet after their names like the tail of a kite; thus they are men of letters and they become puffed up.

They have become so soused in Natural law that they have blinded themselves to all Spiritual law. They overlook the proverb of Solomon, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." God has established Spiritual law as well as Natural law, and each branch has its own separate and distinct field; but our modern philosopher proposes to overthrow Spiritual law and make Natural law cover both fields in defiance of God. Thus he sets about to establish a modern religion professed to be based on scientific research and he calls it "twentieth century Christianity," whereas it is nothing short of twentieth century infidelity. This is only another invention of the devil to deceive the world. He wraps his cloven hoof in the raiment of Christ, thinking the raiment will hide the hoof.

There is a difference between the broad term, religion, and the definite term, Christianity. There is not and never has been a people without a religion of some kind, be they of the highest civilized nations or the lowest heathen tribes. Any sort of Spiritual belief may properly be termed religion, but there is only one Christian religion and that is as already outlined. For any sect to deny Christ as the Messiah or the Anointed One, that is to deny his deity, is prohibition from assuming the title of Christian or of calling its doctrines Christianity. Let it be called religion, but not Christianity. Scripture tells us that "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." This was an epithet applied by the Greeks in derision. But to-day almost every cult adopts the title. Why? Because it is quite impossible to interest any one in a religion that does not profess to be founded on Christ. The Bible, no matter how distorted, and Christ, no matter how much he is crucified afresh and put to an open shame, both must be claimed as the basis of the peculiar creeds if there is any hope for success.

AUTOMATIC CHRISTIANITY

Now, our philosopher tells us that a man automatically becomes a Christian just as soon as he happens to get a good char-

acter, even though he be in ignorance that Christ ever lived. In view of the foregoing, the absurdity of this statement needs no emphasis. Can any one tell how a man just happens to get a good character? A good character is a matter of constant struggle and careful cultivation both to get it and also to keep it. It may be in part hereditary, but that simply means the result of cultivation generations back. This, in the liberal sense as man sees character. A good character as God sees character, means dependence on a higher Power. No good character was ever born that did not have a strain of bad character along with the good. Consequently, there is no good character that will not succumb to temptation under sufficient pressure unless sustained by a higher Power than human power. David fell. Why? He tells us, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity." Momentarily forgetting God, the strain of iniquity overpowered him. Solomon fell. Why? Because he became so enamored of his heathen wives that he drifted away from God. What sustained Joseph in his great temptation? His answer, "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" His loyalty to God saved him. What sustained Daniel? "He kneeled three times a day and prayed as he did aforetime." Prayer to God for strength saved him.

Again we ask, does any one just happen to get a good character? Is it not always and ever a struggle? Will any intelligent man allow himself to be led into such a quagmire of deception? How can any sane person believe in the possibility of automatic Christianity? The possibility of being a Christian without knowing Christ, by simply happening to get a good character—this is certainly absurdity run riot.

> "Man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon divine protection and favor, gathereth a force and faith which human nature in itself could not obtain; therefore, atheism is in all respects hateful, so in this, that it depriveth

human nature of the means to exalt itself above human frailty."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

"Let not a man trust his victory over his nature too far; for nature will lie buried a great time, and yet revive upon the occasion, or temptation."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

"Some, whatsoever is beyond their reach, will seem to despise, or make light of it as impertinent or curious: and so would have their ignorance seem judgment."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

Article Two

IS THE BIBLE GENUINE?

TWENTIETH century Christianity is wholly dependent on the Bible for its existence. Logically, the next question for discussion is the genuineness of the Bible. Is the Bible genuine? Is it the inspired Word of God? If not inspired of God, it is full of error and it is absolutely of no value as a medium of revelation of God to man, and we are still in as much of Spiritual darkness as were the ancient Greek philosophers. If it is inspired of God, it cannot contain error, for God is perfect and all his works are perfect.

Destructive critics tell us that the Bible was not written for three hundred years or more after Christ, therefore it contains much spurious matter—fancies, superstitions, and legends which have been inserted by various writers. By this means they endeavor to undermine those portions which involve the miraculous and the laws of the Spiritual world. What are the facts?

OLD TESTAMENT

The first record of written scripture is Exodus 24: 12 (B.C. 1491): God called Moses up into Mt. Sinai and said, "I will give thee tables of stone, and a law and commandments which I have written." Deuteronomy 31: 26 (B.C. 1451): Moses ordered the books of the law placed inside the Ark of the Covenant. II. Chronicles 34: 14 and II. Kings 22: 8: Hilkiah found the book of the law of Moses (Pentateuch, or five books) in

the house of the Lord (B.C. 624). Jeremiah 36:2 (B.C. 606): the Lord commanded Jeremiah, "Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day." When King Jehoiakim heard what was in the book, he sent for it, read a portion of it, then cut it up and threw it into the fire and burned it. This is the first record we have of a destructive critic. Afterward, the Lord commanded Jeremiah to rewrite the book. This was done. My dear destructive critics, you may depend upon it, when God said, "My words shall not pass away," he meant it. Daniel 9:2 (B.C. 553) refers to learning from the prophecies of Jeremiah. Zechariah 9:2 (B.C. 518) refers to the law and former prophets, showing that the books of Moses and the words of the prophets up to that date had been preserved in writing, and that these were not mere traditions. Nehemiah tells how Ezra read the book of the law in the street before the congregation (B.C. 445). Ezra and the Great Synagogue determined the canon of the law in its final shape, and Nehemiah gathered together the acts of the kings, the prophets, and of David for a library for the second temple, about B.C. 432.

Josephus speaks of twenty-two books accepted as divine, five of Moses covering an interval of about three thousand years, thirteen books of the prophets, and four books of hymns. He says, from the death of Artaxerxes (B.C. 424) no one had dared to add to or change any of the sacred writings. The Jewish canon was therefore settled in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Josephus (A.D. 37-100) distinctly says that his Greek translation was taken from the Hebrew scriptures. The scriptures were found in the various synagogues where they were read and discussed. With about six exceptions, the whole of the Jewish canon is quoted in the New Testament. Our thirty-nine books correspond with the Jewish canon.

Josephus against Apion tells how carefully the Scriptures were kept. "Our forefathers committed that matter to the high priests and the prophets, and these records have been written all along down to the present time with the utmost accuracy (A.D. 37-100). Our forefathers did not only appoint the best of these priests, and those that attended upon the divine worship, for that design from the beginning, but made provision that the stock of priests should continue unmixed and pure." "Every one is not permitted of his own accord to be a writer, nor is any disagreement found in what is written, they being only prophets that have written the original and earliest account of things as they learned them of God himself by inspiration."

These books have been subjected to the strictest scrutiny and criticism by ancient Jewish authorities, by scholars ancient and modern, and by successive councils of the Christian church, and have all been admitted to be genuine.

NEW TESTAMENT

The critical examination of the New Testament books has been no less severe than that of the Old Testament. It is true that no original manuscripts of the evangelists or apostles exist. They were worn out in the early generation. But numerous copies were made from the originals for circulation among the different groups of Christians scattered abroad. It is from such copies that our English Bible has been made up. These manuscripts are divided into an Alexandrine, Latin, Asiatic, and a Byzantine text. After undergoing so many copyings and being scattered to such an extent, of all the very many manuscripts that were gathered from so many different sources for the compilation of our English Bible, comparatively few variations of any importance were found, taking in the sum total of them all. Most of the variations pertained to spelling or inflection; but of the few doubtful readings there were always a sufficient number of texts in agreement to verify the sense.

Early testimony concerning these manuscripts comes from such men as Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and others contemporary with the apostles. These men quote the Gospels and nearly all of the Epistles. Some others who have listed, quoted, and criticized the books of the New Testament, and who have conceded them to be inspired or "holy," are Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Epiphaneus, etc., respectively living from A.D. 135 to A.D. 402.

Now, though necessarily brief, we believe we have shown that our Bible has not been made up in any such careless or speculative manner as some critics try to teach.

OTHER PROOFS OF INSPIRATION

Bacon, on *Atheism,* says: "While the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate, and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity. It is not credible that an army of infinite small portions, or seeds unplaced, should have produced order and beauty without a divine marshal." This is one strong argument favorable to the inspiration of the Scriptures. For in the Bible we have a collection of sixty-six books written by at least forty-four different authors during a period of from fifteen hundred to two thousand years. These writers lived and wrote in different countries, far apart in space and time, some in Egypt, some in Arabia, some in Palestine, in Babylonia, in Persia, in the cities of Asia Minor and Greece, and in the city of Rome. Some wrote when the Pharaohs ruled, some when Solomon built the temple, when the Assyrians roamed in Mesopotamia, some when the Cæsars ruled the world. They wrote in different languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. They wrote in different forms, prose, poetry, history, biography, legislative, philosophy. The writers were from different ranks of society, kings, fishermen, shepherds, and statesmen, rich and poor, uneducated and

learned. They wrote under widely different political, social, and religious conditions, writing from their own point of view, in their own way with marked individuality. They treated of nearly every theme of human thought. "Yet in all this diversity there is such a unity in aim, such a oneness in all the parts, such a consistency in teaching concerning God and man, sin and salvation, that they have been bound together and called preëminently 'The Book.'" There is a life in this book not found in any other. It contains one doctrine of God, of sin, salvation, heaven, hell, and of duty. Very remarkable! "No other collection could be made of books written at such widely separated times and places, by such different men under such a variety of circumstances, even upon a single theme, that would manifest such a unity of thought and purpose. There is but one explanation. The Bible must have been the product of one mind that planned and directed the whole of it from the beginning to the end, and that mind could be no other than God."

No other book could have survived such opposition as has the Bible. It has passed through fire, water, and blood. No other book has been so hated by bad men, and so abused by good men. Put under the ban of excommunication, criticized, ridiculed, and burnt, every possible resource has been exhausted to destroy it, yet it has gone steadily onward. Every century has brought forth opponents, scores of destructive critics have arisen, each with his new discoveries of fatal flaws that would destroy its power. But the critics die. Their assertions are proved erroneous; and the grand old Book gains strength by leaps and bounds.

"Last eve I paused beside a blacksmith's door,
And heard the anvil ring the vesper chime;
Then, looking in, I saw upon the floor,
Old hammers worn with beating years of time.

" 'How many anvils have you had?' said I,
'To wear and batter all those hammers so?'
'Just one,' said he; then, with a twinkling eye,
'The anvil wears the hammers out, you know.'

"And so I thought the anvil of God's Word
For ages skeptic blows have beat upon;
Yet, though the noise of falling blows was heard,
The anvil is unharmed, the hammers gone."

THE BIBLE

"The Bible is the only source of Christian truth;—the only rule of the Christian life;—the only book that unfolds to us the realities of eternity. There is no book like the Bible for excellent wisdom and use."

—*Sir M. Hale.*

"Bad men or devils would not have written the Bible, for it condemns them and their works; good men or angels could not have written it, for in saying it was from God, when it was but their own invention, they would have been guilty of falsehood, and thus could not have been good. The only remaining Being who could have written it, is God—its real Author.

"The Scriptures teach us the best way of living, the noblest way of suffering, and the most comfortable way of dying."

—*Flavel.*

"It is a belief in the Bible, the fruit of deep meditation, which has served me as a guide of my moral and literary life. I have found it a capital safely invested, and richly productive of interest."

—*Goethe.*

"The longer you read the Bible, the more you will like it; it will grow sweeter and sweeter; and the more you get into the spirit of it, the more you will get into the spirit of Christ."

—*Romaine.*

"The general diffusion of the Bible is the most effectual way to civilize and humanize mankind; to purify and exalt the general system of public morals; to give efficacy to the just precepts of international and municipal law; to enforce the observance of prudence, temperance, justice, and fortitude; and to improve all the relations of social and domestic life."

—*Chancellor Kent.*

"Scholars may quote Plato in their studies, but the hearts of millions will quote the Bible at their daily toil, and draw strength from its inspiration, as the meadows draw it from the brook."

—*Conway.*

"The Bible is one of the greatest blessings bestowed by God on the children of men. It has God for its author; salvation for its end; and truth without any mixture for its matter. It is all pure, all sincere; nothing too much, nothing wanting."

—*Locke.*

"The man of one book is always formidable; but when that book is the Bible, he is irresistible."

—*W. M. Taylor.*

Article Three

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF GOD?

WHEN Paul walked the streets of Athens, he saw on every hand temples, images, and groves, erected to gods and goddesses of every known act, impulse, substance, and art. He also saw a number of altars inscribed, "To the Unknown God." The Greeks, fearing that they may have overlooked some god and might, therefore, incur his wrath, erected these altars, to be on the safe side. Paul took this inscription for his text and preached an exceedingly strong sermon declaring unto them the God whom they ignorantly worshiped, and overturning all the theories of the Greek philosophers concerning their gods, creation, immortality, and salvation.

Paul began his sermon with the thought of omnipotence. God created the world and all things therein. This is the first conception of God in nearly every mind. With this thought God begins to reveal himself. It is the first thought in the Bible: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." For centuries philosophers speculated on this subject—creation. Many of them thought they had settled it with the theory of homogeneous association of atoms. But they were unable to account for this congenial association. What caused the atoms to associate in all their various groups? How did the little senseless atoms know to what group they belonged? A satisfactory answer was not forthcoming. It was the revelation of God to Moses, that in the beginning he created heaven and earth and all living things, that gave to man a satisfactory solution of the question. Thus Paul argued with the Greek philosophers.

So now, in discussing God's nature, we start with his omnipotence. In order to account for creation, it is necessary to

concede the existence of some ruling principle, a first cause. This thought dawned upon the old philosophers before the real facts of Jewish revelation became known to them. Hence it has not been a difficult thing for men to accept the God of revelation as the Creator. This being the easiest point of correspondence, it naturally becomes first. Any one who denies God to this extent is a fool. "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." But even here, as Bacon said, "he rather saith it by rote to himself as that he would have, than he can thoroughly believe it, or be persuaded of it."

GOD'S AUTHORITY

As Creator, then, God has authority over the created, to control, limit, arrange in order, determine courses, decree laws, and maintain harmony. Were this not so, the created would be greater than the Creator. That would mean chaos and anarchy. God, then, is Supreme Ruler over all creation. His will dominates all things.

To create order, God must embody within himself the law of order. He must be unchangeable, immutable. He is. "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." Thus sang the Psalmist.

To be able to create, to establish law and order, God must be omniscient—he must know all things. He does. The whole first chapter of Genesis testifies to this. We are told, "God saw that it was good." Everything was measured by God's standard of goodness and perfection. He knows what is good and perfect. Knowledge and wisdom originated with God. His knowledge permeates all creation. Job says, "Hell is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering." Again, "His eyes are upon the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings." Soloman wrote, "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good."

OMNIPRESENCE

Omnipresence is another attribute which must be possessed by a great Creator, that he may be at all times in correspondence with his creatures to maintain his authority and minister to their necessities. God is omnipresent. David said: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

A god who can create perfection and harmony and beauty, must possess these attributes. He must possess them ethically. Therefore, God must be holy. He must be the maximum of holiness. Being holy, he will demand holiness of man created in his own image. God told Moses to say to the people, "Sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy, for I am the Lord, your God." The Psalmist wrote, "The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." Now, a degraded man, debauched in vice, will tolerate and even enjoy degradation, because he is hardened in sin and wholly out of correspondence with righteousness. But the further a man is removed from vice, to just that degree will its horror appear to him; until in the higher plane of morality vice appalls him—he shudders at its presence. Can we imagine, then, a holy God, who would say to one standing in his presence, "Put off the shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground," —with what degree of horror must he turn his face from sin! And remember this: God considers as a sin any act of rebellion against his laws.

The justice of such a holy God must be unequivocal. It is absolute. When God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," he meant it. The devil said, "Thou shalt not surely die," and man took the devil's word for it, just as many are accepting the devil's contradictions to-day. Man by disobedience did provoke the curse of

death, and we know it to-day. God did not create disease, sorrow, suffering, and death. These are the result of sin—of disobedience to God's laws. Death not only applies to the body but also to the soul. God said to Ezekiel, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." God cannot endure sin. He cannot have it about him. It must be annihilated from his kingdom. If it must exist, it must be segregated outside of his dwelling-place. This is God's immutable law, and the Bible rings with its warning from cover to cover. This is just as positive as anything in the Scripture. The physical punishment of the Jewish nation from time to time was prophetic of the Spiritual punishment of sin.

We are clearly taught that all have gone astray and there is none perfect. Our only hope, therefore, is in the mercy of God. In Mt. Sinai, God said he is "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and fourth generation." There is no lack of stableness here. God is merciful and forgiving; but note: he by no means clears the guilty. His mercy and forgiveness are not automatically shed upon the guilty. The guilty must perform some act to secure mercy and forgiveness; otherwise he remains guilty. Then what? "Thus saith the Lord God: repent, and turn yourselves from your idols; and turn away your faces from all your abomination."

PERSONALITY OF GOD

Rather than accept God as he reveals himself in Scripture, some are spinning mysterious phrases purporting to be their belief in what constitutes God. These ambiguous descriptions indicate that few of them really know what they do believe. However, they do deny God a personality. God does not veil himself in mystery. He wants man to know him and to know just as much about him as the mind of man is competent to

grasp. He has tried to reveal himself to man in material ways known as superhuman and supernatural, but perceptible to man's intelligence. He has revealed a personality. We have one positive statement: God is a spirit. That does not preclude a personalty. What do we mean by spirit? Life; living substance considered independent of corporeal existence; an intelligence conceived of apart from any physical organization or embodiment. What is personality? The personality of a man is not merely his physical make-up. It is rather his intelligence, character, will, disposition, force. The corporeal make-up is merely a convenient bit of machinery through which the personality is expressed and by which it may get into correspondence with its environments.

Let us put the two together, spirit and personality. Spirit is the life, the intelligence, the *ego*. Personality is the individuality of that spirit. Man living in a material world, dealing with material things, needs a material body for the expression of his intelligence, his will, etc. God, living in a spirit world, dealing with things in a Spiritual way, needs no material body; however, he is none the less an individual being. Christ in heaven needed no material body. Christ on earth, dealing with material man in a material way required a material body. Christ is just as personal in heaven as on earth. God can see, he can hear, he can speak, he can feel. He is sensitive. He has the power of expression. God is personal. He wants us to think of him as a real being. Then let us not worship at the altar of "the Unknown God," neither worship a god made by the mind of man. Let us be satisfied with God as he has revealed himself to us, and rejoice that we have the privilege to worship him.

Article Four

IS THERE A PERSONAL DEVIL?

IT may seem like an undeserved honor to the devil to introduce him at this time. However, we do not rank him here because of his virtue, but from a logical necessity in the course of our arguments. Hereafter the element of evil will be involved and we must know its principle.

Many would like to eliminate the devil. The writer would do so had he the power. But we cannot do this by a mental process any more than we can eliminate any other existing fact by merely trying to think it does not exist.

We are told that the devil is a myth adopted by the Jews from the Chaldeans or Persians during the Babylonian captivity. But Moses recorded the fact of a devil nearly a thousand years before the Babylonian captivity. Again, we are told that the devil was an invention of the priests for the purpose of frightening the Jews so they would submit to a priestly graft. Any one who cares to read the Scriptural record of the setting aside of the Levites for religious service, and of how they were warned to perform their duties and conduct religious services and ceremonies strictly according to God's laws, will readily see the absurdity of this statement. Nevertheless, please note that nowhere in the Old Testament is the devil held up to the people by the priests for any purpose. The few references to the devil or devils are of an entirely different nature and are not made by priests. Again, we are told that the idea of a devil originated with Milton. But where did Milton get his foundation for "Paradise Lost"? Bless you, he got got it from the Bible. Refer to Revelation, chapter twelve; we find, "There appeared a wonder in heaven, behold, a great red dragon. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth. And there was a war in heaven: Michael

and his angels fought against the dragon: and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. Therefore, rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell therein. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea: for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." This is from the vision of John on the Isle of Patmos. Is it a myth? No. It is an historical fact described, in part, allegorically. Prove the fact.

CERTAIN PROOF

When the seventy returned to the Lord from their field work, they said, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." Jesus replied (Luke 10:18), "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." Here is a positive statement made by Jesus Christ. Did our Lord tell the truth or did he lie? It is either the truth or a lie. There is no equivocation. But then, we may be told that Christ did not make the statement, that it was incorporated by Luke. We have already covered such assertions in our argument on the inspiration of the Bible. Such assertions are the balderdash of defeated Materialists and Universalists. When Scripture contradicts their doctrines, they try to traduce Scripture. Their statements are without foundation in fact, and proof defies them. We will meet the issue squarely. Let us see. Luke was a Greek physician, an educated man, the only Gentile writer in the Bible. His mind was free from any possible Jewish traditional prejudices. He was writing to his friend, Theophilus, a Greek student of Christianity, and a man of sufficient importance to be addressed as "Most Excellent." In his preface, Luke tells Theophilus that he had a perfect understanding of all these things from the very first from those who were eye-witnesses.

And he sets them down in order "That thou [Theophilus] mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

Here is a Greek, to whom Paul refers as the beloved physician, a man of character, writing to another Greek, a friend, for the purpose of vouching for the things in which that friend has already been instructed concerning the life of Christ. Now, can any one advance a sensible reason why Luke would incorporate an invention of his own mind under such circumstances? Only a very base man could make such pretentions to truth and then practice such a deception on a friend. It is not probable that a man could be so base and write such a history as did Luke.

Let us go further. If any disciple, other than Judas, had reason to believe in a personal devil, it was Peter. Here is what he said (II. Peter 2:4): "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell." How did Peter know this? Christ told him. Christ told Peter a great deal about Satan. Still we have another witness; Jude, a brother of James and a near relative of the Lord, said: "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Here is evidence at the mouth of three witnesses which under Jewish law was sufficient in court. There is evidence enough that the disciples all believed in a personal devil and an organized infernal kingdom, and that Jesus did teach that Satan was once an angel of power in the heavenly kingdom.

SATAN'S AMBITION

How could such a discordant condition occur in heaven? Taking the facts as stated, it is apparent that, like man, the angels were created free moral agents. Their loyalty to God depended on their own free will. Otherwise, they would be as slaves and their loyalty would be without virtue. There are

angels with authority. This is shown by the reference to Michael, the archangel or chief angel (Jude 9). Peter also refers to angels which are greater in power and might (II. Peter 2:11). Summing up, we find that Satan was a spirit of power and might. He had an influence over one-third the hosts of heaven. He became proud and ambitious. He became a disturber. He began to falsely accuse the loyal angels, as the voice said in John's vision, "The accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." From being a seditionary, he grew to be an open rebel. Only one result could be possible; he was expelled, and with him all the disloyal spirits who were not satisfied with their first estate. Thus heaven was purged. Can we imagine now that God is going to admit into his kingdom in the future any souls who have not proved their loyalty to him? By no manner of means. God established the moral law of obedience which is just as immutable as the law of continuity in the universe. All talk of God's being so merciful that he is just going to pull men into the kingdom of heaven with grappling-hooks, is clearly out of reason. Heaven now only contains harmony, and no discordant spirit will ever be allowed to disturb that harmony.

SATAN ON THE JOB

Of Satan's purpose after the expulsion, we quote Milton's thought:

> "Of this be sure,
> To do aught good never will be our task,
> But ever to do ill our sole delight,
> As being contrary to his high will
> Whom we resist. If then his providence
> Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,
> Our labor must be to pervert that end,
> And out of good still find means of evil;
> Which oft-times may succeed, so as perhaps
> Shall grieve him, if I fail not, and disturb
> His inmost counsels from their destined aim."

Though but the result of Milton's reasoning, these words contain much of real philosophy. Peter, writing to the elders of the church said, "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." Here the devil is described as a hungry lion seeking his prey. He is truly the adversary of God and man. The devil is no joke. He is not the horned, cloven-hoofed, long-tailed monster often pictured. He does not protrude himself behind any hideous mask. Quite the reverse. "The culture, too, that shapes the world, at last hath e'en the devil in its sphere embraced; the northern phantom from the scene hath passed. Tail, talons, horns, are nowhere to be traced." The devil is cunning enough. His traps display the guilder's art. They are entered through prismatic fronts. They are draped in the finest silks and richest velvets. A smile is his welcome and pleasure is his bait. "In the depths of sensual pleasure drowned, let us our fiery passions still. Enwrapped in magic's veil profound, let wondrous charms our senses thrill. Plunge we in time's tempestuous flow, stem we the rolling surge of chance; then may alternate weal and woe, success and failure, as they can, mingle and shift in changeful dance: excitement is the sphere of man."

But all the while, he stirs his caldron and looks on with a sinister twinkle in his eye, and thinks, "What fools these mortals be," for he knows he is brewing a bitter potion. At the bottom of the pot are dregs, bitter dregs. The pleasure is all vapor and bubbles, but the dregs are a mass of sorrow and distress and bitter remorse.

But there is the church man. A sermon for him. Remember, God is love. God is merciful. God will not punish. Thou shalt not surely die. God made a man of you; then be a man—a real, live man—a strong man—a red-blooded man. Do not be a coward and shift your soul's responsibility onto a Savior. Do not believe all you hear at church. Do not believe in the devil. He is a myth. Learn to separate the truth from legends

and myths. By all means, avoid religious sprees; they are hard on the nerves. Any other spree but a religious spree.

The devil picks smart men to preach his sermons. But they are somewhat like Æsop's fable of the ass which masked in a lion's skin to frighten the other animals of the forest. He succeeded until he tried to roar. Then his bray gave him away.

Christ knew these false preachers would arise and he gave ample warning; for he said: "They will show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. But take heed: behold, I have foretold you all things."

"They that deny a God destroy man's nobility; for certainly man is of kin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not of kin to God by his spirit he is a base and ignoble creature."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

Article Five

WHAT IS MAN'S RELATION TO GOD?

WAY back, many thousands of years ago, man had a birthday. It is not important for the purpose of our argument that the approximation of the time by man is correct. God had created a great material universe. He established order out of chaos. He separated the land from the sea. He clarified the atmosphere so that light and darkness were clearly defined. He caused vegetation to spring forth. He provided seasons for budding, seed time, and harvest. God then created moving life—swimming, creeping, walking, and flying life—always creating on the ascending scale, from lower to higher, from simple to complex. At last God looked upon a world of beauty, a vast botanical and zoölogical garden. God looked at it and pronounced it good. There was absolutely nothing wrong with what had been accomplished. But the climax had not been reached. There was no intelligent being in all that creation. Then God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness, and let him be monarch of all the earth. So, of the material earth, God formed a body with all the necessary machinery for keeping itself in repair and for performing the many functions expected of it. When the body was ready, God breathed into it of his own essence, and the creature became a living soul, an intelligence, an entity; and man opened

his eyes and saw a beautiful world ready for him—a world that needed him and which would gladly supply his wants—a world in which he could be happy. God looked upon man, eminently the greatest of all his creatures. He was satisfied, and stopped and rested from all his labors.

CONSTITUTION OF MAN

Man was a compound creation: first, a body—the material element—the temple of the living God—the means by which the entity might express itself, and by which it might get into correspondence with its environments, and through which it might exercise its will—a body possessing physical desires; second, an intelligence—an understanding, a mind, for receiving and retaining impressions, and for conceiving and imparting thought—possessing mental desires; third, a soul—an emotional force—a will, a moral and immortal spirit, capable of expression, and possessing spiritual desires. Thus man was constituted a mind and soul embodied in a material existence—three forces, each possessing desires peculiar to itself, and either one of which, under favorable conditions, might dominate the whole composite being, man.

It is self-evident that, when God breathed into man a soul, man partook of the likeness of God in purity, holiness, freedom of will, intelligence, emotion, sensitiveness; he possessed a creative faculty and an executive ability. In fine, man partook of the very essence of God. It is important to note here the element of free-will. This power constituted man a free agent. The soul partook of God's nature, but it was thrown off from God and became an independent entity. It was a process similar to the generating process of certain bacteria which multiply by subdivision: the bacterium grows to normal size, then divides itself into two independent individuals, each to go its own way, to grow and subdivide, etc. So with man; he was independent to choose moral ends and determine his purposes in life. As man was gifted with intelligence and reason as well

as will, it is just that he assume the responsibility of his choice, whether moral, or physical.

THE SOUL'S AFFINITY

Now, it is a fact that every nature is inclined to seek its affinity. It is most in harmony with its own kind; hence, we conclude that, of its very nature, the soul of man would seek its original source. It would be entirely in harmony with its source; therefore, we say, man, in his original condition, would naturally and spontaneously seek God, to serve and worship him. In this condition man could not invent evil. Unless that nature should be interrupted by some extraneous opposing force, man would know nothing else than to will to love God and to be as God—pure and holy—and to worship God as the Creator. That is exactly how we find man in his first condition, according to Scripture. God visited him and talked with him; man rejoiced in the presence of God. They were in harmony with each other.

But thus far man's loyalty to God was entirely automatic. Man's will had but one direction; it had no contrary choice; in fact, it had no moral possibility of exercising itself; no moral law had been established, hence no moral law could be violated. God had no pleasure in automatic loyalty. Man had a free will, he must have the privilege of a contrary choice. A whole code of laws was not necessary for this test. Only one was promulgated. It was a broad law; it was a fundamental moral law; it was the law of moral laws—the law of obedience. "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest eat freely: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest of it, thou shalt surely die." There could be no mistake, no plea of ignorance. The tree was pointed out. It stood in the midst of the garden. The law was plainly stated and it had its penalty attached.

We do not understand that there was any real intellectual virtue in the fruit of this tree. It was the law that made it the

tree of the knowledge of good and evil. To obey the law was good; to disobey was evil. The act of disobedience would bring with it the consciousness of having done evil. Once that consciousness was awakened, man would forever know of the existence of the two opposing principles between which he must be constantly choosing.

WHAT HAPPENED

Before proceeding, we pause to ask our materialists and philosophers to consider the foregoing argument on the original holy condition of man, and then explain his subsequent condition and present natural condition without accounting for an evil spirit. It is very tiresome to constantly hear the cry of myth and legend, without any proof. Quit your balderdash and get down to sensible argument. We now proceed.

The opposing force entered the field to interrupt the harmony between man and his God. The adversary approaches the woman with the insidious question, "Indeed, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" implying, God has really circumscribed your liberty. The woman defends the liberality of God: "We may eat of every tree but just the one in the midst of the garden. That we may not touch lest we die." "Oh," said the devil, "Do not believe that. You are the most wonderful of all God's creatures; do not believe he will let you die. God said that just to scare you a little. He knows that when you eat of that fruit you will become as gods, knowing good and evil. Think of it! you will become wise as gods!" The woman pondered for a moment, a fatal moment. She listened. She argued: "The fruit is good to eat. It looks mighty nice. It certainly is desirable to be wise. I believe I have a scientific turn of mind, sort of Ph.D., you know." So she took a bite. She persuaded her husband, and he took a bite. Then they discovered the fact that they had violated the law of obedience. Harmony between God and man was inter-

rupted. The correspondence of the soul with its source was severed.

Notice the nature of the temptation: The fruit was good to eat and pleasant to look at; the curiosity of the body was aroused; the desire of the body asserted itself. The fruit was desirable to make one wise; the curiosity of the mind was aroused; the desire of the mind asserted itself. The conscience —the soul—the God nature—protested; but the other two forces dominated, and sin triumphed. Now, then: God goes forth in the garden to meet man as aforetime. Man no longer rejoices in the presence of God; he hides from God. In that very act he passes judgment on himself. Oh, you men, who say you do not want to worship a God who will judge you, note this: you will save God the trouble; you will pass judgment on yourselves; you will call on the rocks to hide you from his presence. When you sin against your fellow man, you cannot look him in the eye. How do you expect, then, to face God, when you have sinned against him all your mortal life?

It is not necessary at this time to go into the details of the curse which followed. Whether he wants to believe it or not, every man is to-day face to face with the conditions set forth in that ban of Genesis. Every detail is just as true to-day as it was in the day that God pronounced the curse. One important fact must be noticed: excuses were ineffective. There was no excuse. Man voluntarily chose to correspond with the devil rather than with God. He preferred to believe the devil rather than to believe God. He struck a minor chord. He placed himself at discord with God. He is no longer the monarch. He now has to contend against all the forces of creation. Everything in nature is on the defensive. Everywhere man turns he sees death and decay staring him in the face. This is the second state of man. Say, Mr. Philosopher, is it a myth? Is it a legend? We do not care what you *believe* with your narrow, finite mind. You may believe that white is black, but prove it.

If the story of Eden be not true, if the story of Adam's fall

is a myth, if the theory of original sin and the resultant depravity of man is merely of legendary origin, how do you account for the fact of natural immorality, and the general struggle for existence found throughout nature?

Under original conditions, all nature was good and was so pronounced by God. That meant that it was perfect according to his high standard of perfection. All was harmony. If the world is not now under a curse, how do you account for the fact that nature is at war with itself? Why do weeds just naturally grow, while wheat must be cultivated by the sweat of the brow? Why is man's nature instinctively evil? Why is man constantly at war with himself to overcome his natural evil tendencies? Why is it so easy to do evil and so difficult to do good? Why is it true that, as Paul said, "I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me"? Man was not originally so created. God could not so have created man, for God is perfect and all his works are perfect. How, then, has man's nature become so perverted? Men like Dr. Savage may scoff at Genesis, but let them give a satisfactory answer to these questions.

It is not enough to say that human sin is the imitation of Adam's sin; for it is not probable that every human being would be constantly having to fight off sin if it were merely a matter of imitation. By that theory, sin would be altogether an extraneous agent which must be adopted by man. If that were the case, it would be easy enough not to adopt it, and very few, if any, normal or rational men would desire to imitate Adam's sin; and man would not find himself in the position of constantly having to fight against evil, and Paul would not have had to say, "It is no more I that sin but sin that dwelleth in me." To imitate a thing, we must first see the pattern; but in respect to sin, we need no pattern, for man spontaneously commits sin. Cain needed no pattern to enable him to commit murder. The impulse originated within himself.

There must be another answer. Human nature must possess the germ of sin within itself. That is positively the only way we can account for the prevalence of sin in man's disposition. Our sin is the product of Adam's sin, inherited from generation to generation down through all the ages. It is not Adam's sin for which we are held accountable, but our own sin; and we are held accountable because we are free moral agents with the power of choice between the will to obey God and the will to disobey God. No impossible condition has been forced upon us. We have adequate powers, knowledge, and motives to exert our wills to obedience to God. The created constitution of the soul is not such that there are moral tastes or instincts upon which the will cannot act. We are absolutely free agents and fundamentally accountable.

Lyman Beecher says: "God commands the sinner to obey the Gospel; and the sinner, thoroughly furnished with all the powers and means of moral agency, refuses to obey. Rewards, threatenings, entreaties, expostulations, judgments, and mercies exhaust their powers upon him, and he refuses; he will not come to Christ, and always resists the Holy Ghost. . . . Who puts forth more giant free agency than the sinner, full set to do evil? . . . The sinner can be accountable, then, and he is accountable, for his impenitence and unbelief, though he will not turn, and God may never turn him, because he is able, and only unwilling, to do what God commands, and which being done, would save his soul."

This obstinacy is another proof of the innate moral depravity of man. It is another evidence of his natural discordant relation to God under the curse of sin. We find, then, that man's relation to God was originally harmonious, but now discordant; and that harmony can only be restored by obedience to the process which God himself has ordained.

Article Six

WHAT IS SPIRITUAL DEATH?

WE now come to a very important question in our discussion: What is Spiritual death? After a careful analysis, we find these four propositions:

First, A living body and a living soul.
Second, A living body and a dead soul.
Third, A dead body and a dead soul.
Fourth, A dead body and a living soul.

The first is a fullness of life, Natural and Spiritual, present and future. The second is Natural life but Spiritual death, a present life but a future death. The third is Natural death and Spiritual death, a present and a future death. The fourth is Natural death but Spiritual life, present death but future life.

The first proposition embraces man as God first created him —man's first estate. The second embraces man after the temptation. The third is the final condition under the curse. The fourth is the final condition under redemption.

So far as the Natural life is concerned, it faces death from the moment the babe draws its first breath. Through all the periods of its growth and development, every moment is one moment nearer death. This fact is known to all, and with this we have but a temporal concern. But for the soul we have a much deeper concern because of its immortality. It is immortal in life or immortal in death. This may seem a paradox; but let us see:

When God said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," what did he mean? First, we find that the death penalty was to be executed at once—"In the day"—the same day—in fact, the same moment. Then God did not refer to the body. He said, "Thou shalt die"; that is, thyself—that

which thou art—a living soul—shall die. It is the same thought as expressed by God to Ezekiel, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." It is true that after the temptation God said, "Dust thou art, to dust shalt thou return." This did refer to the body. But this penalty was pronounced prophetically—in futurity, and apparently was a penalty distinct from the first which was to be executed at once. The physical man was not to die immediately. Paul said to Timothy, "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth"—our second proposition. Christ said, "Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"—our third and fourth in inverse order.

But how can the soul die, since it is a part of the essence of God and therefore partakes of immortality? What is spiritual death?

DEATH RELATIVE TO LIFE

Dr. Henry Drummond says, "What Death is, depends upon what Life is." Herbert Spencer defines life as "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations." We shall now follow Dr. Drummond's argument in substance, though not verbatim.

"A human being, for instance, is in direct contact with the earth and air, with all surrounding things, with the warmth of the sun, with the music of the birds, with the countless influences and activities of nature and of his fellow men." Thus he is said to be "in correspondence with his environment." He may be influencing them, but he is being influenced by them. "In virtue of this correspondence, he is entitled to be called alive." Now, if the environment change, man must be able to adjust himself to the change, otherwise he cannot keep up the correspondence. For example, when food becomes scarce in one locality, man may adjust himself to these "external relations" by moving to another locality where food is plentiful, or by importing food from another locality. But if he fails to

adjust himself to altered circumstances, then his "internal relations" are no longer adjusted to his "external relations" and life must cease. This Death or want of correspondence may be either partial or complete. Suppose a man is deaf; then he is out of correspondence with a large part of his environment, namely, its sounds. With regard to that "external relation," he is dead. Suppose again he is also blind; then he is thrown out of correspondence with another large part of his environment; the beauties of nature—color and form—are shut out. He is still further dead. Now suppose that his brain is affected so that it ceases to acquaint him with what is transpiring about him; the outside world is still there, but to him it is not. He is still further dead. As he becomes more and more dead, he becomes less and less alive. Finally, suppose that the lungs refuse to correspond with the air; "there is now no correspondence whatever with environment—the whole thing is Dead." "Death is the result, the want of correspondence."

Natural environment is the entire surrounding of the Natural man, the entire external world in which he lives and moves and has his being. He may not be in immediate correspondence with all of his environment. Whether he corresponds with it or not, it is there. Then we have both a conscious and an unconscious environment. In daytime he may not see the moon and stars; he may not be aware of the influence of the polar regions; but they exist just the same. There are organisms which have only the most limited correspondence with their surroundings. A tree corresponds with the soil at its roots, with the sunlight and air in contact with its leaves; but it is shut off from a whole world to which higher forms of life have additional access. To a large part of surrounding nature it may be said to be dead. As to consciousness it is not alive at all. The bird corresponds with a wider environment. The stream and the insect are real to it. The distance beyond the hill is familiar to it. It listens to the love-song of its mate. The bird is more living than the tree; but there is much to which the bird

is dead. Man has the widest correspondence of all creatures. Hundreds of things which the bird never saw in stream, in insect, and in tree, appeal to him. Every single sense in man has something with which to correspond. Man is a mass of correspondences. As we rise in the scale of life, the sway of death is gradually weakened. But is man in correspondence with his whole environment? If there is one outermost circle with which he fails to correspond, then to that circle he is dead. "If he fails to reach, to know, to be influenced by one circle or segment of a circle, then with regard to that segment or circle he is dead." Is man, then, in correspondence with his whole environment? He is not.

THE SPIRITUAL ZONE

Men generally are not in living contact with that part of their environment called the Spiritual world. This is the outermost circle. We separate the animal from the vegetable; but they are the same world, they are different parts of the same environment. The Natural and the Spiritual are likewise one. The inner circles are called the Natural, the outer, the Spiritual. They are outer because they are beyond us, or beyond a part of us. What we have little or no correspondence with, we call Spiritual. But when the appropriate corresponding organism appears by which we can communicate with the outer circles, then the distinction disappears. The Spiritual becomes the outer circle of the Natural. Suppose we call the outer circle God. Then suppose we substitute for "correspondence" the term "communion." Those who are in communion with God live; those who are not, are dead. We can now investigate the essential nature of Spiritual Death.

"We find it to consist of a want of communion with God. The un-Spiritual man is he who lives in the circumscribed environment of this present world." "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." "To be carnally minded is Death." "To be carnally minded is to be limited in one's correspondence

to the Natural man. The mind of the flesh, by its nature, limited capacity, and time-ward tendency, is Death." No matter how noble the earthly mind may be, how cultured, virtuous, and pure, if it know not God, it is Dead. The plant is not a monster because it is dead to the voice of the bird. Neither is the man a monster who is dead to the voice of God. He is simply Dead. The proof is in the utterance of the Dead themselves. They proclaim themselves Spiritually Dead. They correspond only with a Natural and a Material world. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Those philosophers who are trying to build an anti-Christian system on this doctrine, seeking to sap the foundation of Spiritual religion, unconsciously testify to their own dead condition. They admit that they are out of correspondence with the Spiritual circle. When the infidel says he is blind and deaf and dumb and dead to the Spiritual world of Christ, we must believe him. Christ says he is. Paul says he is. Science says he is. He builds his altar to the Unknown God. "He is one correspondence short." "Science has paved the way for one of the most revolutionary doctrines of Christianity," namely, man cannot discern the things of the Spiritual world with a Natural mind. Naturally he is dead to the Spiritual world.

GOD OF NATURE

The Scientist has a God, a most wonderful and glorious God. He sees in nature a Power that is above him. He is absorbed in the contemplation of this Power. He seeks happiness in a knowledge of him. He does not deny God. What he lacks is correspondence. He realizes that there is an environment beyond him. It is this want of correspondence that makes his God the Unknown God. It is this that makes him dead. There is a Natural religion. Not to know that is to know God only in part. For God is not confined to the outermost circle; he moves

in the whole environment. The Christian must know the God of nature as the Psalmist did when he sang, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork"; otherwise, he only partially lives. But he who knows God only in Nature lives not. To correspond with the God of Science assuredly is not to live. "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the *true* God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Space, stars, or rocks are not God. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Without the light of Revelation, the light of Nature is very dim. Pagan Scientists who only had the light of Nature groped in vain to find the Truth. "Nature and Morality provide all for virtue—except the life to live it." The absence of true light means moral Death. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." The mind which is turned away from God, which will not correspond with God, means Spiritual Death. Unbelief in God is sin. Unbelief in God embraces unbelief in God's power to execute his will as he will. To reject Christ and the Gospel of the New Testament is failure to correspond with the greatest manifestation of God's love. It is Spiritual Death.

Article Seven

WHENCE COMES SPIRITUAL LIFE?

WHAT is Spiritual Life? We answer from our former discussion on Spiritual Death, and say: Spiritual Life consists in being in continuous correspondence with the outermost circle of the Natural world, namely, the Spiritual world. But since man is not naturally in correspondence with the Spiritual circle, the question arises, How can man get into correspondence with this outer environment? How can man become alive to the Spiritual world? How can man become Spiritually alive? How can man receive Spiritual Life? Christ said, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." Again he said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Still again, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

For centuries, scientists have discussed the origin of life. There was one school that preached the doctrine of Spontaneous Generation. According to that doctrine antecedent life is not necessary to produce life; that life can spring into being of itself. Experimental proof was produced. Glass jars were partially filled with infusions of organic matter. They were boiled to kill all germs of life, then hermetically sealed to exclude the outer air. After all this apparent care to secure sterility, life did appear inside the jars. It was argued then that life was spontaneously generated. But there were two errors in the experiment. One error was, the experiment was not performed in an atmosphere of absolute sterility. The second was, the temperatures were not sufficiently high to annihilate all life. It was found that certain germs were all but fire-proof. When the experiment was repeated with these errors corrected, abso-

lutely no life appeared. Thus the doctrine of Spontaneous Generation was killed and it became a recognized fact that "life can only come from the touch of life." No life can appear independent of antecedent life.

We have to-day philosophic religionists who teach that Spiritual Life can spontaneously generate itself. It is simply this, that a man may gradually become better and better until, in process of time, he reaches "that quality of religious nature known as Spiritual Life." They claim that this life is not something received from without, but that it is the normal development of the Natural man. Christianity opposes this doctrine. It teaches that Spiritual Life is the gift of the living Spirit, that it is not the mere development of the Natural man. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL KINGDOM

We have two great kingdoms of nature, inorganic and organic. The inorganic cannot of itself pass into the organic kingdom. "No change of substance, no modification of environment, no chemistry, no electricity, nor any form of energy, nor any evolution, can endow any atom of the mineral world with the attribute of life. Only by the bending down into this dead world of some living form can these dead atoms be gifted with the properties of vitality. Without this preliminary contact with life, they remain fixed in the inorganic sphere forever." There is a great gulf fixed between the living and the dead. So between the Natural and Spiritual worlds is a great gulf fixed. The passage is "hermetically sealed on the Natural side." "The door from the inorganic to the organic is shut; no mineral can open it; so the door from the Natural to the Spiritual is shut, and no man can open it." "No organic change, no modification of environment, no mental energy, no moral effort, no evolution of character, no process of civilization, can endow any

single human soul with the attribute of Spiritual Life." The Spiritual world is guarded from the world beneath by a law of biogenesis: "Except a man be born again—except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

In a profound discourse, one of our anti-Christian philosophers recently stated that he believes it possible for some one to acrobat himself into the presence of God, that another might dance herself into the kingdom, or that we may baseball ourselves into the kingdom. Such talk is certainly pitiable. What an imposition it is on intelligence! What a fantastic travesty! But such wild ideas are probably the natural result of getting away from God's truths.

"Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." The admission of the Natural man into the Spiritual kingdom is a scientific impossibility, just as much as it is a scientific impossibility for the mineral to enter the kingdom above without the touch of life from the vegetable. "The plant stretches down to the dead world beneath it, touches its minerals and gases with its mystery of life, and brings them up ennobled and transformed to the living sphere. Just so the Spirit of God reaches down and touches with its mystery of life the dead souls of men, bears them across the gulf between Natural and Spiritual, and endows them with its own high qualities, and develops within them these new and secret faculties by which those who are born again are said to see the kingdom of God." "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life." "There is no spontaneous generation in religion any more than in nature. Christ is the source of life in the Spiritual world." We may hold in one hand a common pebble, and in the other a perfectly cut diamond. The one has small value. It has no beauty. It is only a common pebble and we cast it aside. The other, when held to the light, sparkles and radiates all the colors of

the rainbow. It is beautiful. It is valuable. We prize it. But both the diamond and the pebble belong to the same world. Both are inorganic; both are minerals. Neither can ever enter the higher world unless it be possible for vegetable life to reach down and transform them. So with Natural man. He may be so low as to be repulsive to society, or he may be very moral and refined and of value to society. But in either case he belongs to the Natural world and he cannot enter the Spiritual world until touched by the life of the Spiritual world. "The Natural world is to the Spiritual as the inorganic is to the organic."

MYSTERY OF LIFE

The second birth is no more mysterious to the Spiritual man than the first is to the Natural man. But the philosopher with merely a Natural mind cannot discuss Spiritual Life any more than a mineral can tell of animal life. The mineral knows "nothing of other than chemical and physical laws"; therefore, its criticism of the principles of life would be worthless. Likewise, the un-Spiritual philosopher is incapable of discussing the fact of Spiritual Life because he knows nothing of other than Natural laws. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: neither can he know them." The Spiritual Life is so real to the Spiritual man that he is inclined to think it is only a pretense when the un-Spiritual man asserts his ignorance of the Spiritual world. But such is not the case. It is a scientific fact that he does not know it. It is beyond his Natural mind. It is foolishness unto him, neither can he know it. Christ said so. Science says so.

"The origin of life is the fundamental question alike of Science and Christianity." There is no Christianity without a Living Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." He must be born again. It was hard for Nicodemus to understand this proposition. Some people to-day find it equally hard. They ask,

"Why cannot a man grow better and better of his own accord until he evolve himself into the kingdom of God?" (Few have been so absurd as to ask, Why may he not "tango" himself into the kingdom?) In reply, we ask why a stone may not grow more and more living till it enters the Organic world?

There is a difference between the Spiritual and the un-Spiritual man, between the Christian and the non-Christian, not in physical appearance, not in intellectual attainments, perhaps not much in moral manifestations; but the former has something that does not exist in the latter. "What is the difference between the crystal and the plant? They have much in common: both are made of the same atoms; both display the same properties of matter; both are subject to the Physical Laws; both may be beautiful. But besides possessing all that the crystal has, the plant possesses something more, a mysterious something called Life. This Life is not something that existed in the crystal only in a less developed form. There is nothing at all like it in the crystal. There is not a trace nor symptom of it in the crystal." It is something added to the plant over and above all the properties common to both. So with the man who has Spiritual Life. He has something, "a distinct kind of Life added to all the other phases of Life which he manifests." "The Natural man belongs essentially to this present order of things. He is endowed with simply a high order of the Natural animal life." "But he that hath the Son hath life"—a new and distinct and supernatural endowment. No matter how much this distinction may be ridiculed by Mr. Worldly Wiseman, it is nevertheless a Scientific distinction. The gift of Spiritual Life distinguishes Christianity from all other religions. "Christianity infuses into the Spiritual man a new Life, of a quality unlike anything else in nature"—it is Christ.

Article Eight

IS CHRIST CONCEALED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT?

THERE are those who say they believe in the Bible excepting its mysteries and its miracles, its supernatural and superhuman events. In other words, take God and Christ out of the Bible and the poor souls will believe and accept what is left. They are like vultures feeding on a dead carcass; for, robbed of God and Christ, the Bible is as lifeless as the sphinx of Egypt. It is not remarkable, therefore, that a religion depending on such dry bones for nourishment is without life itself. It offers nothing for a hungry soul. The soul cries for bread and is offered a stone.

One great evidence of life in the Bible is its record of prophecy fulfilled. The supreme evidence of prophecy fulfilled is Christ. It is said that in the Old Testament Christ is concealed, while in the New Testament he is revealed. Paul said to the Romans, "The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." In other words, Spiritual things are revealed by material things. But material things only reveal Spiritual things to the Spiritual mind. The Natural mind knoweth not the things that be of God, neither can it understand them. We must then approach our subject with a Spiritual mind.

We make this positive statement: The New Testament is a fulfillment of the Old Testament. The two dispensations are separated only by a thin partition through which is a door, and that door is Christ. Over the outer side is written "Prophecy," and over the inner side is written "Fulfillment." Christ said, "I came not to destroy but to fulfill." If Christ is prophesied and described in the Old Testament, then the Christ revealed in the New Testament must conform to prophecy in life, character, teachings, and works.

Christ taught that the Old Testament is full of prophecies concerning himself. For example, Luke 24:27: "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." And verse 44: "All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me." Let us examine a few of these prophecies.

The first promise of a Redeemer is found in Genesis, when God said the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. This meant the ultimate defeat of Satan. Paul uses this thought in his letter to the Romans: "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly" (Rom. 16:20). The lineage of Christ was established when God said to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This promise was repeated to Isaac (Gen. 26:4). It was again repeated to Jacob (Gen. 28:14). The lineage was unbroken through twelve generations to David, to whom God made this remarkable promise: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." "Forever" means that there never should be an end to the dynasty of David. As we are taught that material things shall pass away, this promise could only be fulfilled in One who could rule forever. Therefore the dynasty of David—the kingdom of David—must pass from the Natural to the Spiritual state and continue forevermore. The seed of David must then produce a descendant whose kingship would pass in power to the Spiritual world and yet maintain its authority over those still in the Natural world so long as the Natural world exists. This promise was fulfilled in Christ. Luke 1:32-33: "The Lord God shall give unto him [Christ] the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

A FEW TYPES

The Old Testament is full of types of Christ. This fact is confirmed many times in the New Testament. We mention but

a few. When God said to Abraham, "Take thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt offering," God was portraying in this great test of Abraham's faith his own great love for the world when he should offer his only Son as a sacrifice for sin.

Joseph sold into Egypt was a type. He said to his brethren, after he had saved them from starvation, "Ye thought evil against me: but God meant it unto good, to bring it to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." So Christ, sold by one of his disciples, became the Redeemer to save "much people" from Spiritual Death.

Moses, who lead the Israelites out of bondage in Egypt to the promised land, was a type of Christ leading the nations of the world out of the bondage of sin to a new Canaan—to a new Jerusalem. They said to Moses, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?" The Jews said the same thing to Christ. Our learned philosophers are saying the same thing to Christ to-day.

The Ark and Mercy Seat typified Christ. The law was to be put inside the Ark and the Mercy Seat was to be placed above the Ark. This signified that mercy was to reign over law. God said, "And there will I meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the Mercy Seat." But Mercy did not supersede the Law. We may say that Mercy supersedes the penalty of the Law. But not automatically; certain conditions must be met. Paul defines the offices of mercy and law: "Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. For without the law sin is dead. When the commandment came, sin revived and I died. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Sin is not imputed when there is no law. Moreover, the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ, our Lord. We

were reconciled to God by the death of his Son: much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." John said, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth come by Jesus Christ." Jesus Christ, having come to fulfill the law's demands, becomes the Mercy Seat through which God can commune with us and we become reconciled to God. The Jews could not go before the Mercy Seat personally; they were represented by the high priest. So Jesus Christ becomes our High Priest before God. He stands between us and God as our Solicitor.

The Passover Lamb was typical of Christ. A male lamb, without blemish, the first of the flock. Its blood sprinkled over the doors was a sign for the Death Angel to pass over such houses. Christ was the first-born and only begotten Son of God—without blemish. His blood is our sign against the Death Angel of the Judgment.

The Scape Goat was typical. Aaron was to lay his hands on the head of the goat, confess over him the iniquities of the people, and send him forth into the wilderness, signifying that the sins were carried away into forgetfulness. So, Christ bearing away our sins, they are no longer imputed to us. "All we like sheep have gone astray: we have turned every one to his own way: and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." This was Isaiah's prophecy concerning Christ.

Jonah's burial in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights forecasts Christ's burial in the heart of the earth. Christ said, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."

CHRIST'S LIFE FORETOLD

How remarkable in detail is the prophecy of Isaiah spoken over seven hundred years before Christ! We read with wonder, in the fifty-third chapter, of Christ's sufferings, his maltreatment; how he was to be wounded for our transgressions; of

his stripes; how he opened not his mouth; brought as a sheep to the slaughter, taken from prison and from judgment; cut off from the living; his grave made with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; and of his final triumph. We ask, Did Christ measure up to the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah?

Of the works to be expected of the promised Christ, Isaiah foretold: "Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing." Christ said, "I came to fulfill the law and the prophets." Did he do it? When John Baptist, lying in prison, heard of Christ's works, he sent to Christ to inquire if he were really the Messiah. Christ offered his works as evidence. That was all John needed, for he knew the prophecies.

Of Christ's birth, Isaiah said, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." The very nature of Christ's birth was to be a sign. The fulfillment of this prophecy is told in Luke 1: 26-30, and of this we shall speak later. It is remarkable that over seven hundred years before Christ, Micah prophesied, "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler over Israel: whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting." We are all familiar with the birth of Christ in Bethlehem as foretold. Is it not strange that even the very locality of his birth was foretold?

These are a few of the things from the ceremonial laws and the prophets which Christ expounded concerning himself. The Old Testament is full of life because it is full of Christ. Everything that God commanded was for a purpose and with a definite meaning. It is all beautiful and wonderful when we read it in the handwriting of God.

Article Nine

IS THE VIRGIN BIRTH A MYTH?

AMONG other supernatural things taught in the Bible, which have been questioned by our anti-Christian philosophers, is the peculiar character of Christ's birth known as the Virgin Birth. Why should doubt arise? The doubt really seems more remarkable than the miracle. Let us see.

If we follow the reasoning of Epicurus and agree that all things were created by the homogeneous protoplasmic formation of atoms, we come up against the question, as did Aristotle and Democritus, Whence came the atom? Whence came the protoplast? Again, granting the existence of the atom, How did it find its congenial group? How did all the various atoms group themselves to form earth, water, fire, air, life, etc? We are forced to acknowledge a great First Cause, a Supreme Creative Principle or Power. Revelation tells us that this great First Cause or Creative Principle or Power is God. Now, among the works of God we find man—eminently the greatest of all God's creatures. How did God create man? Some scientists have told us that God practiced on the monkey—that man is an evolution of the monkey. Some have tried to trace their ancestry back to certain species of monkey. Well, in some cases, we grant the argument to the affirmative. The symptoms are so favorable. But we are treating the question in its general application. Why should God first create a monkey in order to find out how to make a man? The fact is, this is now a dead theory as are most other theories formerly advanced in contradiction of Revelation, and as will be, in time, all the present-day anti-Christian theories.

Revelation says, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and

man became a living soul." David believed this, for he said, "He knoweth our frame: he remembereth that we are dust."

Solomon believed it, for he wrote, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."

Isaiah taught it—"But now, O Lord, thou art our father: we are the clay, and thou our potter: and we all are the work of thy hand."

Paul expressed his belief, in these words, "The first man is of the earth, earthy."

Yet our philosopher ridicules the idea. Well, if God did not create man out of dust of the earth as he told Moses he did, —just suppose God was mistaken,—will our worthy philosopher tell us how God did create man? The accepted fact is, God created man. Now, then, no matter how, when, or where the creation took place, it is evident that God was not assisted in any way, shape, or form by a human being because there was not a human being nor any human agency to assist him. It is remarkable that God could possibly have got along without a twentieth century scientist or philosopher, but it seems that somehow he did so.

We come now to the next step. God said: "It is not good for man to be alone. He should have a mate." So we are told that God caused a deep sleep to overcome Adam, and he took a rib from Adam's side and used it as a basis for the creation of a female companion. When she was presented to Adam, he said, "She is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman because she was taken out of man."

Paul believed this, as shown by his words, "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man."

Jesus believed it. He said, "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh." Notice the question, "Have ye not read?" Read where? Where could

they have read it? Why, bless you, there was only one place they could have read it and that was in the Book of Moses from which we have just quoted. Did Jesus actually believe in the Book of Moses—that book of myths and legends? On another occasion he said, "If it were not so I would have told you." Yes, and if this were not true, Jesus certainly would not have said it is true. Yet our Mr. Philosopher ridicules the Book of Genesis and the recorded history of the creation of man.

We admit that God created woman as well as man. Would it have been any easier to have made her directly from the earth, or to have collected a lot of atoms from the air, than to have created her out of Adam's side as stated? It seems that God chose the latter method. Perhaps he did not know that it would not be approved by the twentieth century philosophers. Perhaps there was a reason. We believe there was. We believe the reason is given in these words, "And they shall be one flesh"—words spoken at the creation and again by our Lord. It was to signify how God regards the marriage vow. Bone of bone and flesh of flesh. What God hath joined let not man cleave asunder.

We now consider the case of Abraham and Sarah. According to natural physical law, human life arrives at an age when the power of generating ceases. Abraham and Sarah had passed this age. "Now Abraham and Sarah were old and well stricken in age; and it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women." Yet the Lord told Abraham that he would return unto them the time of life and Sarah should bear him a son. This seemed so ridiculous to Sarah that she laughed and doubtingly asked, "Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old?" And the Lord said, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" Well, Isaac was born as the Lord promised. So in this case it seems that natural law was suspended or overruled. It was not too hard for God to do that. It appears that God is really able to do some things out of the regular order.

Now, to digress a little. This very birth of Isaac, as Paul explained to the Galatians (Gal. 4:22-24), was an allegory. Abraham had a son, Ishmael, by an Egyptian bondwoman, Agar. But his wife, Sarah, had born no children up to the time of her old age. Isaac was the child of promise, born of a freewoman (Gen. 16). Now, Paul says: Agar represents Sinai, in Arabia, standing for the first covenant, the law, "which gendereth to bondage"; and Sinai stands for Jerusalem, "which now is, and is in bondage with her children," that is, under the law. But Sarah, the freewoman and wife of Abraham, represents the Jerusalem above, or Jerusalem under redemption, the mother of the redeemed. This is the second covenant. And so, Paul argues, as Isaac was the child of promise, so are we, the redeemed, children of promise. "But as then, he that was born after the flesh [Ishmael] persecuted him that was born after the Spirit [Isaac], even so it is now" (Gal. 4:29). And to-day, we find that our un-Spiritual religionists, who are living under the bondage of law, are ridiculing those who are living under the new covenant of Mercy, through Jesus Christ our Lord. "Nevertheless, what saith the Scriptures? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman" (Gal. 4:30). This is prophetic of the end of those who prefer the bondage of the law to the freedom under Jesus Christ.

We now proceed.

CONCERNING CHRIST'S BIRTH

Now, then, what were the prophecies concerning the birth of Christ? Isaiah 49:1: "The Lord hath called me from the womb"—apparently meaning that the voice of God should simply call Christ forth, no human agency considered. Again, Isaiah 7:14: "The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Over seven hundred years prior to Christ's advent it was foretold that he should come forth from a virgin. Luke,

the physician, gives us this record of the fulfillment: "And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in the womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Luke wrote this to Theophilus. Both were learned Greeks. Luke was a physician thoroughly familiar with all natural processes in a professional way. Yet he is writing this to his "most excellent" Greek friend, that he "might know the certainty of those things, wherein he has been instructed."

Matthew tells us that Joseph, when he discovered his wife's condition, knowing that they had not exercised their matrimonial privilege, was ashamed and wanted to put Mary away privately. It was then that the angel revealed to him the divine origin of Mary's conception.

Why doubt it? Is anything too hard for the Lord? Why should God depend upon human agency for the embryo of Christ's body? If God could create the first Adam without human agency; if God could create the first woman out of the side of a man; if God could transcend Natural law for Abraham and Sarah; why should he be denied the power to create the body for the second Adam without human agency? Why should God be limited to Natural law which itself is subject unto him? Human agency and Natural law were entirely out of the question, for Christ had lived from the beginning, and this birth was merely an incarnation. The regular process would have injected a life that would have been absolutely inconsistent with a perfect incarnation of a preëxisting life.

We cannot accept the Scriptures or the teachings of Jesus and deny the fact of Christ's preëxistence to his advent on earth. We read: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." Said Christ, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." In Christ's prayer for believers as recorded by John, we find, "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." Christ invariably and positively taught that he existed with God prior to his advent on earth. He was born "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Was it any easier for God to create the first Adam from dust, or from atoms, or from anything you will have, than for him to call forth his Son from the womb? God might have chosen other methods, but he chose this one. It was preëminently the best method, for it gave to us a Christ complete in all human manifestations, comprehensive to the natural mind. It gave to every little child a Jesus that the child mind could grasp and that the child heart could love. It was a method that could strike a responsive chord in every mother's breast, and cause the busy father to pause and bow in reverence. Obviously, no other method would have given us the same conception of Christ, and it is clear that no other method could possibly have been so beautiful in its simplicity, nor so complete in its revelation to us of God as a Father to us, his children.

Article Ten

DID CHRIST TEACH SOCIAL SERVICE?

GREAT stress is being laid on the Social Service or Welfare Work of Christ. The demand is made of the church, from certain sources, that it stop preaching so much of future life and give more attention to the practical questions of the present life. But those who see in the life of Christ only temporal welfare work have but a meager and inadequate conception of his earthly mission. They only see the human Jesus and not the Spiritual Christ. Likewise, they fail to understand the very purpose of the church.

What was Christ's mission? His answer is, "I came not to destroy but to fulfill." "I came that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." Christ's so-called welfare work was only intended as an evidence of his Deity. The New Commandment and the Golden Rule in application were to be the spontaneous result of the new Spiritual life. The nature of welfare work is temporal. It pertains to this life. Christ's interest in this life was that it should be a preparation, a development, and a test for the future life. Now, the wheat and the tares, the sheep and the goats, are growing together. They are being detected. Christ constantly taught that we should not concern ourselves unduly about the things of this world. "Take no thought for the morrow." "Lay not up treasure on earth but lay it up in heaven." "Seek first the kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you." This is the attitude he taught. Social service is fruit of the vine and not the vine. It is a by-product of true Christianity. But Christian Social Service has only to do with those things that uplift and help mankind. There is a tendency to include things that are naturally opposed to Spiritual life and even social life.

Sunday baseball and the public or municipal dance-hall cannot be considered as within the scope of Christian welfare work. When a police detail is required to guard any amusement or recreation, there is an implied acknowledgment of existing danger. Danger is never uplifting.

Prophets foretold that at the advent of the Messianic period, the blind should receive sight, the deaf should hear, the dumb should speak, the lame should walk, and the poor should have the gospel preached to them. These were to be signs by which the Messiah should be recognized. In fulfilling these prophecies Christ wrought the signs for his identification. The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being manifested by the things that are made." The purpose of Christ was, to be seen in his Spiritual power through the manifestation of his Material works. "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

When Christ healed the man born blind, and he was asked for whose sin the man was born blind, Christ answered, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." "The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe that the Father is in me and I in him.

When the Jews refused to accept Christ, he said: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Christ refers the Jews to the very books of Moses which our un-Spiritual philosophers are ridiculing to-day. Had

the Jews understood these books, had they interpreted them correctly and believed them, they would have recognized Christ and believed him. It was because of this unbelief that the works were performed with the view that their eyes might be opened.

Why did Christ raise Lazarus from the dead? His answer, "To the intent that ye might believe." "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." We might go on to show that the whole purpose of Christ's works was to reveal his identity with the Father. Had Christ simply preached that he was the Messiah without showing any evidence, then every one might be excused for not believing and accepting him. But as Christ told the Jews that Moses would condemn them for their unbelief, so may we be sure that we shall be condemned if we believe not in the face of prophecy and works. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light."

Welfare work is not going to save us. "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." This is the class that denies Christ as the Redeemer and tries to substitute welfare work for Christianity. Pity those who to-day are denying the deity of Christ and who say, "We do not covet the title 'Christian' if one must believe the myths and legends and miracle-stories of Genesis: that God came into the world, through the birth, by a virgin, of a God-man: that all hope for humanity is conditioned upon knowledge of and belief in this God-man, etc." And whose whole "reliance is upon a world of nature, as a world of law and order, into which no miracle has ever intruded."

Did Christ perform miracles? Let his enemies testify. When Jesus went to Nazareth to teach and perform his works that

the people might believe, the Jews said: "We know this man and his whole family. Whence obtained he this wisdom and this power to do such mighty works?" And they drove him out of the country. But notice: in condemning him, they acknowledged his "mighty works." When word reached Herod of the wonderful miracles Christ was performing, the Jews, not being able to account for the wonders otherwise, said, "He is Elijah returned to earth." But Herod said, "No, he is John Baptist, whom I beheaded, returned from the dead; therefore he is able to do these wonderful things."

After the raising of Lazarus, many of the Jews who had seen the miracle believed on him. Then the Sanhedrin held a council, and said: "What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation." And they conspired to put him to death. Here we see that the Jewish council, which, as a body, were, from first to last, enemies of Christ, acknowledged that he did many miracles. On one occasion, after this miracle, Christ was stopping at the home of Mary and Martha. Lazarus was present with a company of others. The Jews, coming up to Jerusalem to the Passover, heard of the miracle and "much people of the Jews therefore knew he was there: and they came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead." The fact to notice is: the fame of the miracle had spread all over the country. It was no secret event. And "by reason of him [Lazarus] many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus." Then "the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death." Here again we have the witness of Christ's enemies to the fact of this miracle.

On one occasion, when Christ had restored sight and speech to a man, the Pharisees said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of devils. They acknowledged his work but imputed it to evil spirits. When Pilate

sent Jesus to Herod, he was "exceeding glad: for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him." Thus we see that among the common people and in the political and ecclesiastic circles it was recognized that Christ performed wonderful miracles. We also have the statement of Josephus, who, though not a follower of Christ, was, however, a true historian. He says, "Now, there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works." We have only appealed to the enemies of Christ for proof. We have gone where we would naturally find evidence against him if any existed. But we have found, on the contrary, proof positive of Christ's wonderful works. But there is another we have not mentioned. There was Judas Iscariot, a member of the inner circle, one of the select twelve, one who was constantly with Jesus both in public and in private. He was familiar with all the innermost councils; if there were any deception, if there were any legerdemain, if there were merely an hypnotic influence exercised, Judas would know the secret, and Judas, the traitor, would be glad to tell us. Let us ask Judas while the tainted silver is tinkling in his pocket. Judas, was there any deception in Christ's miracles? Listen to him as the anguish of remorse gnaws at his heart; yes, listen to that deep moan of the demoniac as he rushes in to the high priests and throws the silver at their feet and cries out, Oh, I have betrayed innocent blood! I have betrayed innocent blood! then straightway goes out and commits suicide.

Then listen to his enemies as they mock him while hanging on the cross: "He saved others, himself he cannot save."

Oh, you who are denying the Christ, the Anointed One, the Savior, you who are trying to ridicule his miracles: Do you not see that you are crucifying him afresh? You are actually trying to kill the Christ in the twentieth century—why? Listen to the words of Jesus, whose teachings you say you accept—

listen to these words from his lips: "Ye seek to kill me because my word hath no place in you."

"It is written in the prophets, And they shall be taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me."

"I have a greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me" (John 5:36).

"Beware how, in making the portraiture, thou breakest the pattern."

—*Lord Francis Bacon.*

Article Eleven

WHAT DID CHRIST TEACH CONCERNING HIMSELF?

THE Board of Trustees of a Unitarian church recently published a statement in which they took exception to these articles on Christianity, accusing them of hostility to Christianity. They point with pride to the following statement adopted at a national conference of their Church: "These churches accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accord with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man."

Taken by itself, this statement sounds very good. Some of the leaders of this sect have also stated at various times that they believe in the teaching of Jesus. Let us test these assertions.

There are no more important teachings of Jesus than those concerning himself. They involve everything pertaining to the Christian religion, including the source of Jesus' doctrines and his authority as a teacher.

What did Jesus teach concerning his identity? John 16:28: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father." John 8:42: "I proceeded forth and came from God: neither came I of myself, but he sent me." John 8:58: "Verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am." John 17:24, from Jesus' prayer: "Father, thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world."

These are a few of the passages in which Jesus claimed existence with God prior to his incarnation.

Did Jesus teach his equality with God? John 5:17: "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." For this saying the Jews sought to kill him because they said he made himself equal with God (John 5:18). John 10:30: "I and my Father are one." For this the Jews took up stones to stone him, for, they said, "thou, being a man, makest thyself God." John 10:38: Jesus told the Jews, "Believe the works: that ye may know that the Father is in me, and I in him." John 5:23: Jesus said, "All men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent him."

CHRIST EQUAL WITH GOD

The foregoing are only a few of the passages which show clearly that Jesus taught that he was preëxistent to his advent on earth, and that he and God are one and equivalent. There is no equivocation. The statements are positive. If we are to claim belief in the teachings of Jesus, we must believe these, for they are a part of the teachings of Jesus. We have not drawn on the prophets, nor the disciples, nor the voice from heaven. We have only taken Jesus' own words. Do our un-Spiritual friends believe them? Here is what they published through their Board of Trustees: "If, in order to be a Christian, one must believe that God came into the world, through the birth, by a virgin, of a God-man, that all hope for humanity is conditioned upon knowledge of and belief in this God-man, then we must admit that we do not covet the title. We are Christians if to be a Christian is to have a triumphant joy in the fact that Jesus was a man, a product of humanity." In other words, they do not believe Jesus when he says that he is come into the world as God manifest in the flesh. Yet they say that they believe his teachings. How do they reconcile their two statements?

If Jesus did not possess deity as he claimed, then he lied. These are plain words, but why varnish the truth? Come right out and say what you mean. We can understand you better in plain terms. Now, if Jesus lied, then he was the greatest imposter that ever lived and deserves no honor whatever, and all his teachings are vain, for they are without authority. Then let us drop Jesus and go back to Moses, who was a great teacher, leader, and law-giver. Let us be satisfied with the Proverbs of Solomon and the Songs of David. None of these men can be accused of being hypocrites, imposters, or blasphemers.

These deniers of Christ claim to believe the teachings of Jesus. What did Jesus teach concerning himself as the Redeemer? Read John 3:16:

> "God so loved the world, that he gave his
> Only begotten
> Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not
> Perish, but have
> Everlasting
> Life."

Notice that the initial letters of each line, reading downward, spell the word "GOSPEL." Did you ever realize that the whole Gospel is bound up in this one verse?

Now read verse eighteen: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

Matthew 18:11: "The Son of man is come to save that which was lost."

John 10:9: "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved."

Again, we have quoted but a few of the passages bearing on the question, and all are the recorded personal teachings of Jesus. It is absurd to say that Jesus only thought of saving

men from themselves in this life. The whole weight of his works and teachings contradicts this thought. His promise of everlasting life through belief on him, proves that he had no thought of merely a temporal moral uplift. He emphatically taught that he is the door to everlasting life for those who were dead in sin. Do our un-Spiritual friends believe this? They claim to believe the teachings of Jesus. Their Board of Trustees states that they do not believe that all hope for humanity is conditioned upon knowledge of and belief in this God-man. Yet Jesus says it is. Their leading light, Dr. Charles W. Eliot, says of Jesus, that he is "the supreme teacher of religion, whose teachings have proved to be the undying root of all the best in human history since he lived." This is good. Every Christian can subscribe to this statement as a fact. But in the face of this fact, Dr. Eliot denies the very teachings of Jesus that cause the fact to be. Jesus said that he and God are one and equivalent. Dr. Eliot says this is not so. Jesus said eternal life is only accessible to those who believe on him and accept him and confess him before men. Dr. Eliot says this is not true. The rank and file of Dr. Eliot's sect say this is not true. Then Jesus lied. If he lied he was an imposter and a blasphemer. Is such a man to be accepted as "the supreme teacher of religion"? Could the teachings of such a man prove to be "the undying root of all the best in human history since he lived"?

THE LINE DRAWN

Matt. 12:33: Jesus said, "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good: or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit." Matt. 7:16: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Verse 18: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." A tree does not bring forth two kinds of fruit—part good and part evil. The analogy is, that a supreme teacher of religion cannot teach part good and part evil doctrines. As Christ would have it: Do one of two things;

either make the teacher good all the way through and his teachings good all the way through, or else make both the teacher and his teachings corrupt throughout. If he is a thorn or a thistle part of the time, then, depend upon it, that is his nature all the time. Christ permits of no middle ground. He proposes to stand or fall with each individual on the evidence of his teachings and his works as a whole. They are either all good or all bad. He grants no permission of selection as to which of his teachings shall be accepted and which shall be rejected. He claims that they are all of his Father-God. Jesus said, "He that is not with me is against me: he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad" (Matt. 12:30). Figuratively, Jesus draws a line and places everybody on one side or the other of this line. All who are with him are placed on one side. All who are against him are placed on the other side. Those who go with him must go with him all the way. Those who believe on him must believe him to be all things that he claimed to be. If we doubt him in some things, then we are not with him in those things. We are not wholly with him. Then, according to Jesus, if we are not wholly with him, we are against him. We cannot straddle the line and jump from one side to the other and back again. We cannot ridicule his deity, his works, his resurection, his ascension, his saving power—all of which he taught by personal prophecy and by fulfillment, and by plain, unequivocal statements—and then say we believe his teachings. That would be an absurd position to take. We cannot call him a liar, an imposter, and a blasphemer in one breath and then praise his teachings in the next. The tenet of Jesus is: Those who are not for me are against me, first, last, and all the time. Where do we stand? Are we for him? or are we against him?

Article Twelve

IS THERE A HOLY SPIRIT?

WE now come to a very important question in the discussion of the Christian religion. What did Christ teach concerning the Holy Spirit?

There is no doubt that Christ taught the existence of a triune God. All through his ministry he spoke of the Father, referred to himself as the Son, and promised to send the Holy Spirit after his departure from earth. In his last words he commanded the disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature and to baptize believers in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Our un-Spiritual friends deny that there is a Holy Spirit, a third person in the Godhead, which deals with mankind. They do not understand the Holy Spirit because they are out of correspondence, or communion, with the Spiritual world. But there is not a truly converted and regenerated Christian who would deny the existence of the Holy Spirit, because every such person, who is living a true Christian life, has had and is having daily the experience of the presence of the Holy Spirit as Christ promised.

John 14: 16-17: Christ said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." If we had no other evidence of the deity of Christ, the fulfillment of this promise would be sufficient. It is because of this daily evidence in the Christian's life that he is proof against all the false and foolish doctrines of anti-Christian teachers. Those so-called Christians who have wandered into heterodox sects

may have been church members, but we say positively that they were not true Christians and we have Christ's words to back us up. Every such person has previously opened the way for evil to get into his life by worldly absorption crowding out the Spirit of God. We notice that Christ refers to the Holy Spirit as the Comforter and the Spirit of Truth. This interpretation is made clear in verse 26: "The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

THE HOLY SPIRIT TEACHES

The Holy Spirit, therefore, is a teacher. He is the Spirit of Truth. He teaches the Truth. He is sent in Christ's name. He abides with the Christian and dwells within him. By this indwelling of the Spirit of Truth, the Christian is divinely taught the Truth as revealed in Scripture. In other words, the Christian spontaneously receives and believes the Spiritual truths of Scripture because they are made clear to him. He discerns them Spiritually. This implies, of course, that he seeks instruction.

The Natural mind cannot understand these things because it tries to reason them out from Natural laws. It tries to prove Spiritual questions by Natural science. This cannot be done. Christ said so. Christian experience teaches it to be so. Un-Spiritual philosophers talk about Truth and they do not know Truth, because the Spirit of Truth is not in them. They are blind leaders of the blind.

This Spirit of Truth proceeds from God. John 15:26: "The Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." That is why the Christian does not doubt the deity of Christ. The indwelling of the Spirit of Truth is a daily testimony of the truth of Christ's deity. The Christian has within him a witness to the fact direct from God's throne. John 16:13: "When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide

you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come." Those who seek the Truth will be guided into all Truth by God through the medium of the Holy Spirit by which God himself communicates to those who are prepared to receive the Truth. Those who worship at the throne of their own intellect are blinded to the Truth because they combat the Spirit of Truth. For that reason, as Paul said to the Corinthians, "the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." On the other hand, these philosophers, in trying to teach things they do not understand, are constantly uttering the most consummate folly.

Jesus said (John 16:15), "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he [Holy Spirit] shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." The Holy Spirit has access to all things, and he will show these things, or reveal these things, to us. But in order to teach us all these truths, the Holy Spirit must dwell within us. He cannot teach us from without.

Every one cannot receive the Holy Spirit. Christ said so. Men of the world cannot receive him. Such men do not know him. We must first be born anew. Not until we are regenerated can Christ send the Holy Spirit to us to dwell within us. The Spirit of Truth is holy. He cannot abide in a temple contaminated by sin. The temple must first be cleansed. When the Spirit of Truth dwells within us we can take up God's Word and the things that were darkness to us will become illumined by the Light of Truth. The Spirit will guide our thoughts into all Truth. But there is something the Holy Spirit will do for those still in the world. John 16:8: "When the Holy Spirit is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." That is to say, that the Holy Spirit will convince the world of these things. All Spiritual progress is made through the convincing power of the Holy

Spirit. He cannot dwell within an unconverted soul, but he will endeavor to draw such a soul to Christ by working from without, by convincing it of sin because of unbelief and non-acceptance of Christ. He will strive to do this. But God said, "My Spirit will not always strive with man" (Gen. 6:3). So while the Spirit will strive from without and will work patiently for a time, there comes a time when the Spirit will depart forever. This brings us to the thought of

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN

The question is not always clearly understood. What is the unpardonable sin? We undertake to answer from Scripture as we understand it.

God said, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in vain, for God will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain." One is not held without guilt who profanes God's name. But this does not indicate unpardonable guilt. Jesus said (Matt. 12:32), "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him." Jesus will overlook disrespect toward himself if one repents of the sin. But notice this (Matt. 12:31-32): "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor the world to come. I say unto you, all manner of blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." Jesus said this when the people accused him of having an unclean spirit (Mark 3:20). It is a sin to lie to the Holy Ghost. (Acts 5:3-5) Ananias and Sapphira, by making a false pretense of contributing their entire possessions to the church, were condemned for lying to the Holy Ghost and both were stricken dead. It is a sin to try to commercialize the power of the Holy Ghost. (Acts 8:18-24) Simon, the sorcerer, thought to purchase the power of the Holy Ghost. Peter said, "Pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." Peter considered forgiveness doubtful. It is a sin to grieve the Holy Spirit.

(Ephesians 4:30) "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." It is a sin to quench, or hold back, or hinder, the Holy Spirit. (I. Thess. 5:19) "Quench not the Spirit." It is no light thing to ridicule "Religious Sprees" in order to push one's hobby of playgrounds, Sunday baseball, and municipal dance halls under the surveillance of the police department.

We are dependent on the Holy Spirit to bring us to the point of repentance, for regeneration, to teach us the truth, to reveal Christ, and to guide us in righteousness. It is obvious, therefore, that if we disrespect him in any way, we shall be without these blessings, for he will leave us and we shall remain in our sins without pardon. These are the teachings of Jesus.

Article Thirteen

WILL THERE BE A FINAL JUDGMENT?

THE various ideas concerning the Judgment Day may be summed up as follows: *First,* There will be a definite, general, final judgment; *Second,* Judgment is passed individually at dissolution, and the soul passes at once to its destiny; *Third,* All judgment is executed in material ways during mortality; *Fourth,* Judgment is a myth as all souls are to be saved regardless of the deeds of this earthly life.

What we believe, is not material. The question is, What did Christ teach concerning the judgment? Whatever he taught is final, regardless of our belief. Our opinion will not alter the fact any more than a leopard can change his spots or an Ethiopian his skin.

In several of his parables, Christ taught a definite final judgment. The parable of "The Wheat and Tares" illustrates how the good and bad shall be separated. Christ explained the analogy. The wheat represents the redeemed; the tares, children of the devil; the harvest, the end of the world, or the Messianic Age. At that time, just as wheat is separated from tares at harvest, the wheat gathered into barns, and the tares put in bundles and burned, so shall the redeemed and unredeemed be separated. In the parable of the net of fishes, Christ again explains how the good and bad shall be separated at the judgment. Other illustrations are found in the parables of "The Wedding Garment," "The Ten Virgins," "The Talents," etc.

Sin is a destructive force. Every form of sin eventually brings an individual form of material or physical punishment in this life. This may be called a Natural sentence, but it is not the final or Spiritual judgment.

One day, while sitting on Mount Olivet, Jesus looked across the Valley of Jehoshaphat toward Jerusalem. He saw the

temple. He thought of his efforts to establish his Messiahship with the Jewish hierarchy. He thought of how they had despised and rejected him. Then he thought of the future when he should be exalted to a throne far more glorious than these men could possibly imagine. It was then that he said to the group around him, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory" (Matt. 25:31). When? He did not know. The angels in heaven do not know. "No man knoweth the day nor the hour." "Only my Father knoweth." This is the only thing about the judgment that Jesus claimed not to know. All the rest is to be in his hands. God alone can forsee when the church shall eventually arouse herself and put on her wedding garments preparatory to receiving the Bridegroom. But Jesus spoke of the day as a positive fact—a day positively defined. It is utter folly for men to prophesy any particular or certain day or year. All such prophecies have failed in the past and they shall fail in the future. The time shall come as a thief in the night—when no man is expecting it. It shall come as the lightning which flasheth in one part of the heavens and shineth unto another. Men will be about their customary pursuits as in the days of Noah. Two shall be grinding at a mill; one shall be taken and the other left.

How shall the Judge come? In his glory—all the holy angels with him. Jesus contemplated it with a heart saddened by the seeming failure of his three years' ministry among the Jews. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered thee as a hen doth her chicks under her wing, and ye would not."

Upon what a scene will he look! (Verses 32-33): "And before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left." David said (Psalms 50:4-5), "He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he

may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me." The heavens shall be called upon for the departed spirits while the earth shall produce those still mortal. John said (Rev. 20: 12-13), "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened, and the sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell [grave] delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to his works."

CLASSES AND CONDITIONS

Yes, there will be a general final judgment. What a multitude of classes and conditions will appear before the great Court. Men of darkest ages—of mediæval times—of modern times—from times of gross ignorance to times of highest intellectual attainment; men of all colors; men of all religions—Atheists, Agnostics, Infidels; men of all languages; men of all vocations; men of all standards of morality and immorality; rich and poor, high and lowly; but in all this heterogeneous mass the Judge shall see just two classes—only two—sheep and goats. Thousands of classes before the judgment, only two after: the sheep—defenseless, dependent, needing a shepherd, obedient, willing to be led, submissive; the goats—pugnacious, stubborn, self-reliant, not submitting to guidance, defiant of the shepherd and rebelling against him, preferring to live in their own strength. "And he shall set the sheep on his right"—the place of honor—"but the goats on his left"—rejected. Christ, once the open door to the sheepfold, now stands between the sheep and the goats as a closed door.

Our un-Spiritual friends rebel against this idea of the judgment. Will they complain then? Rev 6:5: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains: and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the Lamb." The glorious holiness and purity of the

Judge shall so awe those who have lived in sin and who have not been redeemed, that they will seek shelter from his presence. Thus they will, in fact, pass judgment on themselves. They will be like the lepers of old who stood without the city walls and cried out, "Unclean! Unclean!"

In his first epistle, 2:28, John says, "And now, little children, abide in him: that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." Those who abide in Christ shall love his appearing. They shall rejoice at his coming.

NO DISPUTES

There will be no disputes. Every person will just naturally go where he belongs. Society here adjusts itself to certain standards. Every one seeks and is admitted into a certain class. So will it be in the judgment. Matt. 25:34: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." We find Jesus in three successive capacities—Redeemer, Judge, King. He has conquered. His triumph is complete. To his followers—the heirs to the kingdom—he does not say, Go into the kingdom, but Come with me, "that where I am there ye may be also." You have suffered with me, you shall be glorified with me. You have acknowledged me before men, I will acknowledge you before my Father. He says, Inherit the kingdom—receive the right of being joint heirs with me; not that you have purchased it—not that you have earned it—not that you even deserve it—but because you are children of God through faith in his Son, Christ Jesus. You are children of faith and obedience, heirs through the death of Christ.

"Then shall he say to them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." The King with the redeemed will enter the heavenly kingdom. The door will be shut forever. Outside will

be darkness and wailing and gnashing of teeth. It will be hell enough just to be outside.

Our local philosopher sometime ago gave public utterance to the thought that it is the height of the Christian's joy to imagine himself as redeemed and standing on a mountain top, looking down into a valley of suffering souls lost forever, and gloating over their miseries. Such a statement is so absurd that it seems impossible for it to emanate from a well-balanced mind. Just as Christ said, "There is more joy in heaven over one soul that is saved than over ninety and nine just persons that go not astray," just so there is always rejoicing in the church when a lost soul is redeemed. It is the endeavor of true Christians everywhere to carry the gospel to the unsaved.

At the very least, it is the desire of every Christian to see men saved whether he works his desire or not. No. There will be no rejoicing over those who are left outside. The redeemed will rejoice because they have at last reached home. Through faith they have overcome trials and temptations, discouragements and doubts, but at last, though scarred and maimed, they stand in the presence of their King, triumphant.

Do not waste your time criticising God because he cannot admit rebels into his kingdom, but rather subscribe to the constitution of the kingdom of God and become loyal subjects. Since John Baptist first cried in the wilderness of Judea, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand," the church has continued the cry, "Repent—believe and accept!" Those who persist in turning a deaf ear to the invitation of the church and the warning of the church, will only have themselves to blame when they come face to face with the Judge and have to cry out, "Unclean! Unclean!"

Why is the judgment such an unthinkable thing when applied to the Spiritual kingdom? Is it a terrible thing for human society to arrest and place on trial the criminal—the violator of criminal law—and, finding him guilty, to incarcerate him in prison? We say, No. It is necessary to withdraw him from

society. Otherwise society would not be safe. Neither property nor the person would be safe. For that reason, the law is enacted and enforced. Then why should not the society of heaven be equally well protected? But you reply that the presence of God in heaven will prevent evil, and that when the soul reaches heaven the conditions will be different and it will no longer desire to do evil or rebel against God. But where is your proof? The evidence is against you. God is just as present in this world as he will be in heaven. The soul will be just as much of a free moral agent in heaven as it is in this world. If it has rebelled against God in this world; if it has refused to obey the injunctions and commands of God here; how can it be trusted in heaven? Being in heaven did not prevent Satan and his cohorts from rebelling against God.

No. This world is the testing ground. We are now in the refiner's pot. The true metal is being separated from the dross. We are surrounded by good and evil. We constantly have two pictures before us for our selection. We may choose either one. God is daily showing us the results of evil and likewise of good. He is asking us to weigh the results. He asks us to carefully make our choice. All of our sorrows, our difficulties, our afflictions, our reverses and distresses, are agents like a "refiner's fire and a fuller's soap." If our faith fail not, we shall pass through the valley of the shadow of death in glory, for we have tested out true metal. But if, in the face of God's warnings, we persist in evil and continue to rebel against God's ways, then we have shown our true character to be dross and unfit for the kingdom. Whatever our lives are here, they will be hereafter. If they are not in harmony with God here, they never will be, and we would be in discord with the spirit of heaven and a constant menace to the peace which is promised to the followers of Jesus Christ.

Is the judgment such an unthinkable thing? We believe it is a very logical thing. At any rate, Christ positively taught it as a certainty and we must accept it.

"To die, to sleep;
To sleep: perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub;
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause."

—*Hamlet, Shakespeare.*

Article Fourteen

IS HELL A MYTH?

WHILE nearly every one believes in heaven and lives in the hope of a future existence free from the evils of this mortal life, a great many are unwilling to accept the idea of eternal punishment or hell.

Many people prefer to spend this life in unrestricted license rather than to submit to the Moral and Spiritual obligations of Christianity; then they rebel at the thought of paying a penalty for disobeying God's commands. They try to satisfy their conscience by an enforced belief that there is no hell, and that somehow every one is to be saved in the end.

The strange fact is, that the very authority on which our belief in heaven is based is exactly the same authority for the fact that hell exists. Almost without exception the two—heaven and hell—are coupled in every Scriptural reference. We find that invariably when Christ promises salvation to believers, he also states that unbelievers shall be damned. He says they are damned already because they do not believe. When he says, "Enter, ye blessed, into the joy of your Lord," he also says to the unredeemed, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting darkness." Every one familiar with Scripture knows this to be true. We give a few examples. Matt. 23: 14: "Woe unto you, scribes

and Pharisees, hypocrites: for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers; therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." Verse 33: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." John 5:29: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Matt. 3:12: "He shall thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire."

The argument resolves itself into two questions: Did Christ mean what he said? What did he mean when he said it?

Christ never said anything he did not mean. He said (John 9:5), "I am the light of the world"; in other words, knowledge, revelation of Truth. As a revealer of Truth, Christ could only speak Truth. He never said anything to mislead. He was clear, positive, and unequivocal in all his statements. He said (John 14:22), "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you." If the things concerning heaven were not so, Christ would have told us. Likewise, if the things concerning hell were not true, Christ would have said so. But, contrary, most of what we know about hell comes from Christ's own statements. Then, what did he mean by his reference to hell?

HELL FIRE

Take one reference—Matt. 5:22: Jesus said, "Whosoever shall say [to his brother], Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." This term, "hell fire," is from the Greek, *Gehenna,* Hebrew, *Ge-Hinnom.* It has reference to the Valley of Hinnom. This is a narrow valley south of Jerusalem. Here Molech, the god of the Ammonites, was formerly worshiped, part of the ceremony being the passing of the worshipers between two fires.

See II. Chrom. 33:6: "He caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom." Jeremiah 32:35: "They built the high places of Baal which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech." God had forbidden the Israelites to have any part in this worship; but time and time again they had disobeyed. After the Babylonian captivity, the Israelites showed their abhorrence for the worship of Molech by turning the Valley of Hinnom into a common sewer for the city of Jerusalem. Here all the rubbish and filth of the city was taken to be burned. There was an incessant fire smouldering, and flaming at times, and a constant smoke issued from the ravine. This came to be referred to as typical of the place of eternal punishment. Then to be in danger of Gehenna, or Ge-Hinnom, to the Jewish mind, was to be in danger of being cast out of the kingdom amidst the filth, just as the rubbish of Jerusalem was cast into the Valley of Hinnom outside the city. Christ uses this thought again in Matt. 13:41, 42: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." John saw this in his vision (Rev. 21:8) "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone which is the second death."

Some say that this earth is all the hell there is and that this is hell enough for any one. Can an earth be hell where "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork?" True, the earth is under a curse, but God has not withdrawn his face from it. He loves it still. Yes, with such a boundless love that he gave his only Son to redeem it. The Spirit of God is abroad in the land. The voice of God chimes forth from every church belfry. Every Christian pulpit resounds with the message of God's love and the invitation

to come into the kingdom. The influence of God's people is felt wherever the gospel is preached. Even those who are scoffing at the church are living under the blessings of the church. They are benefiting by the presence of God's Spirit. Take away the Bible, the church, and all Christian people with their institutions, then you will have hell on earth, for then you will have driven out God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. When all those who are forsaking God, criticising the church, denying the Bible and Jesus Christ, and reviling God's people—when all these unregenerated and degenerated are finally left to themselves, with God's face withdrawn, then they will have real hell and plenty of it.

Let us not waste time discussing whether or not hell consists of real fire and brimstone. Let us say it is enough that hell is where God is not. Let us say it is enough to know that hell is outside the walls of the heavenly kingdom, where there are no songs of praise, no Christian love, no hope, no good. Let us say it is enough to be alone throughout eternity with the fires of a remorseful conscience, the experience of which is so well portrayed in Shakespeare's *Richard III.,* before the battle of Bosworth Field: "My conscience hath a thousand several tongues, and every tongue brings in a several tale, and every tale condemns me for a villain. Perjury, jerjury in the highest degree; murder, stern murder, in the direst degree; all several sins, all used in each degree, throng to the bar, crying all, Guilty; guilty: I shall despair. There is no creature loves me."

But let us remember this: hell was not created for mortals. Christ said it was prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41), "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." We are not told that God created hell. The devil and his angels were cast out of heaven. The place that received them became hell. Hell is the devil's kingdom. It is for those who by choice have selected the devil as their king. This is done by rejecting Christ as King. Neither God nor Christ casts into hell. They simply say: "Depart. Go

to the kingdom you have chosen." Christ warns against this evil kingdom; Luke 12:5: "But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; Yea, I say unto you, Fear him." You see here that Christ says it is the devil that casts into hell.

But what about the millions who have died in ignorance of God and Jesus Christ? This question is asked by our un-Spiritual friends. We may rest assured that our personal responsibility for the salvation of heathen peoples begins and ends in our own generation. God will take care of the past. Previous generations of Christians are responsible in part at least for previous generations of heathen. Our burden is not the millions who have died in past generations, but the millions who are living and dying to-day. It is to these that Christ commands us to go preach the Gospel. It is the blood of this generation that is upon our shoulders if we do not our duty. Missionaries find in all heathen people an inherent knowledge of right and wrong. So that even without the knowledge of God and Christ, it is evident that among them, those who do wrong do it by choice—of their free will. So they are not wholly without responsibility. It is apparent that their ignorance is due to ages of separation from God. Christ commanded us to carry the Gospel to them that they might have the opportunity of regaining their lost estate. Finally, to those who are worrying about the justice of God in dealing with these heathen people and at the same time are denying the Bible and Jesus Christ, we commend for thoughtful consideration these words of Jesus (Matt. 11:21, 24): "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which have been done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you; It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shall be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in

Sodom, it would have remained unto this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."

Does this not imply that the Judge will consider the capacity and opportunities of nations for knowing the true God? Christ compared the opportunities of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum with those of Tyre and Sidon and Sodom, and he said that in the Judgment it would be more tolerable for the latter than for the former. Now, if there were to be no tolerance at all for the latter, then there would be nothing on which to base a comparative degree for the former. So that, inasmuch as a comparative degree of tolerance is expressed, it must be that some consideration is to be given the lack of full knowledge of God and Christ.

Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom stood out in the Jewish mind as monstrously wicked cities. Yet, said Christ, had they seen the mighty works of God that had been witnessed by these Jews, they would have repented without hesitation in sackcloth and ashes.

Now we wonder what relative position is held by the people of to-day, who, after all the centuries of Christian enlightenment, are denying Christ and the vicarious atonement, and are trying to destroy God's Word. That is something to think about. Just turn it over in your minds, dear un-Spiritual friends.

There is still a deeper inference, we believe, in this statement of Christ. It is this: The people of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom, while not having the advantages of the Jews of Christ's time, were still accountable as having some knowledge of God and of right and wrong. They possessed a natural, instinctive consciousness of right and wrong and some sense of a deity. No matter how far removed from the first man, Adam, it seems to be a fact that every man, every tribe of men, however savage, has some apprehension of God's existence. Men universally know that there is a God, and that he is their Creator.

Cicero observed, "There is no nation so barbarous, no race so savage, as not to be firmly persuaded of the being of a God." Even those who in other respects appear to differ but little from brutes, always retain some sense of religion, so fully are the minds of men possessed with this common principle, which is so closely interwoven with their original composition.

John Calvin concluded that since there has never been a country or family, from the beginning of the world, totally destitute of religion, it is a tacit confession that some sense of the divinity is inscribed on every heart. Of this opinion idolatry itself furnishes ample proof; for we know how reluctantly man would degrade himself to exalt other creatures above him. He further says: "God hath furnished the soul of man with a mind capable of discerning good from evil, just from unjust; and of discovering by the light of reason, what ought to be pursued or avoided. To this he hath annexed the Will, on which repends the Choice. The primitive condition of man was ennobled with these eminent faculties. He possessed Reason, Understanding, Prudence, and Judgment, not only for the government of his life on earth, but to enable him to ascend even unto God and eternal felicity. Man had received the power indeed, if he chose to exert it; but he had not the will to use that power."

The whole argument shows that man does not lack the capability of doing good, but that he lacks the perseverance to use his will in the conquest of evil. Therefore, we conclude that, even though ignorant of the nature of the true God, yet even the savage knows good from evil, and if he pursues evil he does it of his own choice and thereby perverts his own soul. He is held accountable, not for the things of which he is ignorant, but for the things of which his own nature is cognizant. On this basis Christ said, "It shall be more tolerable for those people in the judgment than for the people, who, having full knowledge of God's nature and will, yet persist in evil." It is to say, that for those partially unenlightened there will be a

degree of tolerance but not without accountability. But for those who have the opportunity of receiving the Truth as Christ taught it, but refuse to receive it, there will not be even as much tolerance as for the heathen. We find small consolation, therefore, in the condition of the heathen as an argument against hell.

Article Fifteen

IS CHRIST'S RESURRECTION A MYTH?

LAST Easter Sabbath, 1914, Mr. Herbert S. Bigelow, preacher-politician of Cincinnati, made an address at that city on the subject, "Wasting Tears at Empty Tombs." In the course of that address he said, "Although I believe in the immortality of the soul, I do not accept the story of the resurrection of Jesus." Then he attempted to show that the evidence of the Evangelists, because of conflicting statements, is of such a character that to-day our law courts could not even establish as a probable fact the miraculous resurrection of a man. The most important thing connected with this address is the fact that the audience is reported to have applauded Mr. Bigelow's statement. Why should people rejoice to hear a politician endeavor to wipe out Christ's demonstration of the fact of the resurrection of the dead? The question of Job, "If a man die shall he live again?" was a question over which ancient philosophers argued *pro* and *con*. It was a question on which the Jewish Pharisees and Sadducees disagreed. The Pharisees believed in the resurrection of the dead, while the Sadducees denied it. There was only one way to settle the question and that was by divine revelation. God proposed to answer the question for the Spiritual enlightenment of the world and it was for Christ to demonstrate the fact. Paul said to the Corinthians, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (I. Cor. 15: 14-20).

Regarding the statement of Mr. Bigelow, that the testimony of the Evangelists would not stand in court to-day, we must say that this preacher-politician, among other things, is apparently a very poor lawyer. Professor Simon Greenleaf, LL.D., an accepted authority on legal matters, disagrees with Mr. Bigelow. (*Greenleaf on the Testimony of the Evangelists.*) Dr. Greenleaf says:

"The genuineness of the Scriptures admits of little doubt, and is susceptible of as ready proof, as that of any ancient writings whatsoever. The rule of municipal law on this subject is to inquire first, when an ancient document is offered in evidence, was it found in the place and under the custody of persons with whom such writings might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found? This custody gives authenticity to the documents found with it. If they come from such place and bear no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes them to be genuine, and they are admitted in evidence. The burden of showing them to be false and unworthy of credit devolves upon the objecting party. Now this is precisely the case with the Sacred Writings. They have been used in the church from time immemorial, and they are found in the place where they ought to be looked for. They challenge our reception of them as genuine writings. They are found in familiar use in all the churches of Christendom, as the sacred books and standard of of their faith. They are received as the plain narratives of the men whose names they bear, made public at the times they were written. As to originals being lost and only copies being produced, the municipal law answers, The multiplication of copies was a public fact, in the faithfulness of which all the Christian community had an interest. In matters of public and general interest, all persons must be presumed to be conversant, on the principle that individuals are presumed to be conversant with their own affairs. The persons, moreover, who multiplied these copies, may be regarded, in some manner, as the agents of the Christian public, for whose use and benefit the copies were

made; and on the ground of the credit due such agents, and of the public nature of the facts themselves, it is not necessary that they should be confirmed and sanctioned by the ordinary tests of truth. If any ancient documents concerning our public rights were lost, copies which had been universally received and acted upon as the four Gospels have been, would have been received in evidence in any of our courts of justice without the slightest hesitation. These copies of the Holy Scriptures having been in familiar use in the churches from the time when the text was committed to writing; having been watched with vigilance by so many sects, opposed to each other in doctrine, yet all appealing to these Scriptures for the correctness of their faith; and having in all ages, down to this day, been respected as the authoritative source of ecclesiastical power and government, and submitted to, and acted under in regard to so many claims of right, on the one hand, and so many obligations of duty, on the other; it is quite erroneous to suppose that the Christian is bound to offer any further proof of their genuineness or authenticity. Contrary to the usual course in courts of chancery, the Christian writer seems to have been deprived, by infidels, of the common presumption of charity in his favor, and his testimony is unjustly presumed to be false, until it is proved to be true, and the testimony of a single profane writer, alone and uncorroborated, is allowed to outweigh that of any single Christian. This treatment has been applied to them as a body, without regard to the fact that, being independent historians, writing at different periods, they are entitled to the support of each other; they have been treated as if the New Testament were the entire production, at once, of a body of men, conspiring by a joint fabrication, to impose a false religion upon the world. The four Evangelists should be admitted in corroboration of each other, as readily as Josephus and Tacitus, or Polybius and Livy. The discrepancies between narratives of the several Evangelists, when carefully examined, will not be found sufficient to invalidate their testimony. Many seeming contradictions will

prove, upon closer scrutiny, to be in perfect agreement; and it may be confidently asserted that there are none that will not yield, under fair and just criticism. If these different accounts of the same transactions were in strict verbal conformity with each other, the argument against their credibility would be much stronger."

Dr. Greenleaf then proceeds to examine the character of the Evangelists, their opportunity of becoming familiar with the events of their several histories, and the internal evidences of the integrity of their writings, and he shows conclusively that they are in harmony with each other and that their testimony is unimpeachable. He calls attention to the fact that the several narratives are straightforward accounts of the events recorded; that there is an apparent indifference as to whether they are believed or not. There is an evident consciousness that the writers were recording events well known to all in their country and times, and undoubtedly to be believed like any other matter of public history.

EVIDENCES OF RESURRECTION

Let us now point out briefly a few of the evidences of Christ's resurrection as found in these Gospels. We must bear in mind that, after Christ's death on the cross, the disciples were discouraged, fearful, and doubtful. Christ had foretold his death, resurrection, and ascension in order to prevent this very condition, but the disciples did not comprehend. When the resurrection was first reported to them, they refused to believe. It became necessary for Christ to convince the disciples themselves. Under these circumstances, their testimony to the fact of the resurrection should be accepted as evidence that they were convinced.

Mr. Bigelow says there is a discrepancy in the records as to the time when the women went to the sepulchre. Let us see. All four agree that it was very early in the morning on the first day of the week. Matthew says, "as it began to dawn"; Mark,

"at the rising of the sun"; Luke, "very early in the morning," that is, deep morning or early dawn; John, "early the first day of the week, when it was yet dark." Matthew, Mark, and Luke agree. Does John disagree when he says it was yet dark? It is commonly said that the darkest hour is just before dawn. Then just at dawn or as the horizon shows the first signs of the rising sun, it is not erroneous to say that it is yet dark or before full daylight. It was the twilight of early morning and each writer was telling the story in his own way. Had they all said it was the "Fourth Watch," there would have been no criticism, yet there would have been a latitude of from three to six o'clock in the morning according to our present time. Any reasonable mind can only accept the statements as being in perfect harmony.

Next we are told that the Evangelists do not agree on what women went to the tomb. Matthew says, "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary"; Mark, "Mary Magdalene, Mary, mother of James and Salome"; Luke, "Mary Magdalene, Mary, mother of James, Joanna, and others"; John, "Mary Magdalene." We notice they all agree on Mary Magdalene. It was she whom Jesus healed of "seven devils." She is afterward spoken of as ministering to Jesus, and evidently she was a leader among the women. It was to Mary Magdalene that Jesus first revealed himself after his resurrection. Because of this prominence each is particular to mention her. Then Matthew, Mark, and Luke all mention Mary, mother of James; but while John only mentions Mary Magdalene, it does not follow that he denies that others were present. In fact, chapter twenty, verse two, indicates that John did know of the presence of others, for he records that Mary Magdalene said, "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre and we know not where they have laid him." The plural pronoun "we" indicates the presence of other women not named by John. Mary Magdalene is alone mentioned by John because it was she who came running to John and Peter with the announcement that the body of Jesus

was gone, and John and Peter ran at once to the tomb without first meeting the other women. John was, therefore, only concerned in mentioning Mary Magdalene as being the one who first brought him the information. In no case are we to presume that the Evangelists were impressed with the necessity of each mentioning by name all of the women who went to the tomb. This was merely an incidental matter, particularly after they had seen the Lord themselves. The principal fact is that certain women went to the tomb, found it empty, and immediately brought word to the disciples. The same individuality occurs in the report of any important event as told by different persons familiar with any of the facts. Because all of the details are not specifically mentioned by each narrator, is no reason why each is presumed to contradict the other. But the sum of all the facts narrated simply makes up the complete narrative. Here again we find no discrepancy.

Mr. Bigelow next asks, "Did any of the men witness any of these extraordinary happenings?" Matthew and Mark do not mention any of the men as going to the tomb. Luke says Peter was there, and John mentions Peter and himself. It is evident that Matthew and Mark saw nothing important in the visit of Peter and John, as they added no new information to the reports of the women, they not having seen the Lord at that time. No one doubted that the body was gone, but the disciples did not believe the reports of the resurrection. Luke wrote his book after carefully testing tradition by documentary evidence (see chapters 1:5; 2:2; and 3:1), and by comparing the oral testimony of living witnesses (chapter 1:2, 3). He was a colleague of Paul and came in contact with Peter, from whom he secured much information. Hence he mentions Peter in this connection. John in writing his own book naturally incorporates his own experiences, thus he mentions the details of himself running with Peter to the tomb. But all of this has little bearing on the fact of the resurrection.

Mr. Bigelow asks, "Did any one see the stone rolled away?" He says that Matthew implies that the two Marys saw the phenomenon, while the other Evangelists say the stone was rolled away when the women arrived. In regard to Matthew, he is wrong. Matthew says, speaking of the arrival of the women, "There was a great earthquake," etc. In other words, there had been a great earthquake, etc. Matthew clearly implies, like the others, that the stone was already rolled away. He reports the angels as saying, "Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen," etc. This shows clearly that the resurrection had already taken place as the other three state. Here again we find no discrepancy.

THE EARTHQUAKE

Matthew is the only one who reports the phenomena connected with the resurrection. Since this all occurred before the visit of the women, where did Matthew get his information? We recall that, before his conversion, Matthew was a politician. He held the position of collector of customs at Capernaum. No doubt he was acquainted with the Roman and Jewish officials at Jerusalem. What would be more natural than that he should go to official headquarters for information? It was there that he heard directly or indirectly from the Roman soldiers their account of the events attending the opening of the tomb. It was there he learned of the bribes offered the soldiers to say that Jesus' body was stolen by the disciples. All of the other details questioned by Mr. Bigelow, minor as they are, can be just as easily explained when the texts are carefully compared. But we pass to the positive evidences of the resurrection.

That the tomb was empty must be admitted on the evidence of the women, of Peter and John, and of the Roman soldiers. If there were no resurrection, what became of the body? According to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the angel said, "He is risen." John says that he and Peter went into the tomb and found the linen clothes lying to one side, and the napkin, that

was about Jesus' head, carefully folded and lying by itself. Had this been the work of robbers, no such care would have been in evidence. The theory of robbery would have to take into account the governor's seal, to break which was punishable by death; also the Roman soldiers, for whom death awaited any dereliction of duty. There is absolutely nothing to the theory of robbery or conspiracy.

We have the evidence of prophecy for the resurrection. For example, Isaiah 53: 10-12: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." Psalms 16: 10: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Jesus foretold his death and resurrection by his baptism. He spoke of it many times. John 10:15-17: "I lay down my life, that I might take it again." "I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." Matt. 12: 40: "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." John 2: 19: "Destroy this temple [body], and in three days I will raise it up."

We have the evidence of Jesus' appearance to many after his resurrection. We will not describe them here but merely mention them: To Mary Magdalene at the tomb; women of Galilee at Jerusalem; two disciples on the way to Emmaus; Peter at Jerusalem; ten apostles in the upper chamber with Thomas absent; again with Thomas present; seven apostles and others fishing on Tiberius; five hundred Christians mentioned in I. Corinthians 15; James the Less, I. Cor. 15; eleven apostles and others on Ascension Day. These appearances were all so evident that all of the disciples, even Thomas the Doubter, were convinced of the resurrection. Jesus proved that he was not a spirit but that his body partook of flesh and bones. Luke 24:39: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." The disciples were asked to witness the scars in his hands and feet

and the wound in his side. Acts 1:3: "He shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." While Stephen was being mobbed, he cried, "I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God" (Acts 7:56). Then we have the testimony of Paul (Saul of Tarsus). He was an enemy of the Christians. He was having them imprisoned and put to death. He had received letters authorizing him to go to Damascus to persecute the Christians there. On the way he was stricken to the ground and heard a voice from heaven saying, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Was Paul convinced? Evidently so; for, from being a great menace to early Christianity, he became the greatest exponent of Christian doctrine who has ever lived. Read his defence before Agrippa, Acts 26: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead? For the king [Agrippa] knoweth of these things, before whom I speak freely; for I am persuaded that none of these things are hidden from him; for this thing was not done in a corner." Yes, these were all events of public knowledge at the time. Finally, we have the evidence of the Holy Spirit, which is present in the world to-day as Christ promised. He is a daily witness that these things are true.

"WHAT WILL YOU DO WITH JESUS?"
—*Pilate.*

APPENDIX

The following articles were not published with the foregoing but were prepared in connection with them. They are added here as treating on questions of common argument.

WHAT DID JESUS TEACH CONCERNING THE SABBATH?

A CERTAIN local philosopher delivered himself, at a Sunday service, of the following:

"The Sabbath, or Sunday, is of human growth, and has grown quietly and slowly like any other human institution." Again: "When we say that the Sabbath is a law of God, for very truth's sake we ought to be sure of what we mean." Then he speaks of periods of rest adopted by various pagan nations. He then says, "The Sabbath originated in Western Asia, very likely ten thousand years ago, among the Babylonians." Further, he claims that Jesus protested vigorously against the rigid blue Sabbath, and that he said that man's interests are supreme over those of the Sabbath; that "Paul put it up to the individual to decide about certain days being of special sanctity"; that Jesus said "Man is lord of the Sabbath." Then he exhorts us to make a newer and more sensible Sabbath—"one of devotion in the morning, of abandon in the afternoon, and of education in the evening." That is what our philosopher says. What did Jesus teach? But first, What did God say of the Sabbath?

Genesis 2:2-3: "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Again, Genesis 20:8-10, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work" etc.

We are not discussing what a day meant to God. We are pointing out that God divided his work into six periods, whatever you want to consider those periods to be, and that there was a seventh period in which God ceased to labor on the creation, and that God blessed that seventh period, and that seventh

period is represented in our calendar as twenty-four hours succeeding six other similar periods of twenty-fours. In other words, one-seventh of man's time, taken in regular intervals, belongs to God. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It does not say that it is the Sabbath of man. It belongs to God. It is sanctified. It is holy. It is obvious that such a period can only be practically observed when it is so observed by a whole community, whether considered as a municipality, a state, or a nation.

Paul did say, "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be persuaded in his own mind." In the early church there often arose discussions between Gentile and Jewish Christians as to the observance of certain Jewish customs. Circumcision, unclean foods, ceremonial observances, all came up for decision at various times. Peter found it hard to break away from these old customs, and for that reason he was not as successful among the Gentiles as was Paul. It was in the matter of deciding some of these points among the Romans that Paul used the above words. In Romans 14, where these words are used, we find that Paul is not discussing the Sabbath but is discussing the matter of foods and the observance of feast days. In the present day, Paul would no doubt say, "It does not matter whether you observe the first day of the week or the seventh day, just so you observe one day"—just as the Jews observe Saturday, while the Gentiles observe Sunday. If the Jew observes Saturday, to him Saturday is the holy day. But note what Paul says, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." To observe the day as a holy day, we must regard it unto the Lord. The Jewish observance of Saturday in a Gentile community shows how impractical it is not to have a day uniform in the entire community. For the Jew is almost forced to transact business on Saturday, while he likewise is forced to close business on Sunday. Hence, he worships to

some extent on one day and rests on another. Devotion and rest should go together for the observance of the day as holy according to the Mosaic law and the Ten Commandments.

From the foregoing we see that the Sabbath is not of human origin, but is an institution of God. There is no true foundation for the assertion that the Mosaic laws were originated by Moses, or that they were copied from Egyptian or other laws, for it was a peculiar code. All through the Old Testament, when we read of the Jews going after other gods, we find them violating the laws of Moses and indulging in practices that were entirely foreign to the laws laid down in their code. At such times the temple was neglected. Sometimes during these periods of apostasy the law was entirely forgotten. We find instances like the case of King Josiah, who was really ignorant of the law. When the Book of the Law was found in the temple while he was having it repaired, upon hearing it read, King Josiah rent his clothes because he saw how fearfully the nation had violated the laws. These facts prove that the laws and customs of other nations were not only dissimilar but absolutely contrary to the laws of Moses. Furthermore, Jesus Christ constantly taught the authenticity of the Mosaic laws. Our philosopher would destroy these laws by denying their recorded origin. This is more than Christ himself would do, for he said, "I came not to destroy the law but to fulfill." And "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." And again, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven."

Now, what was Jesus' attitude toward the Sabbath? Did he consider it of human origin? Luke 4:16: "As his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and stood up for to read." We find it was Jesus' custom to go to church on the Sabbath, and there he taught the people from the Book—the Law and Prophets—the very books which our philosophers

tell us are full of myths and adaptations from various pagan nations. Jesus did not so consider them. Evidently Jesus considered the Sabbath as a day of devotion. Jesus said, "It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath."

In what respect did Jesus protest against the rigid blue Sabbath? The Scripture on which our philosopher bases his argument is found in Matthew, twelfth chapter, also Mark 2: 23-28, and Luke 6: 1-5. It was on a Sabbath, and Jesus and his disciples were walking through a wheat field, presumably returning from the morning service at the synagogue. The disciples, being hungry, plucked some ears of wheat and began to eat them. Some Pharisees saw them and rebuked Jesus because, they said, his disciples profaned the Sabbath. In his reply Jesus made two statements which others, as well as our philosopher, misinterpret. First, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Second, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." What did Jesus mean?

Christ did not say that man is lord of the Sabbath as our philosopher states. He said, "The Son of man is also Lord of the Sabbath." Jesus constantly called himself the Son of man. He meant that he personally was Lord of the Sabbath. This was true because Christ himself originally issued the law concerning the Sabbath. We make this statement regardless of the absurd claims of our philosopher concerning the ancient Scriptural record. For Christ distinctly says that he was in the beginning with God. And we are told that all things were made by him and without him was not anything made. He made the Sabbath. He gave the law concerning the Sabbath. And the law was rigidly observed by the Jews. It was not a day of feasting and hilarity as stated by our Mr. Philosopher. The Jews were not allowed to gather manna on the Sabbath, for instance. All the way through the Mosaic laws the Sabbath was rigidly sanctified even as to the preparation of sacrifices. The statements of our philosopher originate either from gross ignorance or wilful deception. Christ was Lord of the Sab-

bath—"also." Note this word, "also." He was Lord of all things including the Sabbath. Being Lord, or the maker of the Sabbath, he knew better than the Pharisees the true purpose of the Sabbath. He could interpret its divine meaning as Lord of the Sabbath. He said, "The Sabbath was made for man." But he did not say that it was for man to use as he pleases. Christ recognized man's need of a Sabbath—a one day in seven when all human energy should be given a rest from its strain of the other six days. He recognized that the physical machine could not go on indefinitely without rest. But the day would be robbed of its purpose in this respect if men, while they ceased from labor, were to be encompassed with multitudinous laws of restriction that would make the day one of punishment and judgment rather than one of peaceful relaxation and rest. He referred to laws enacted by the Pharisees and not the laws of Moses. In this respect man was not made for the Sabbath. Because of sin, man was condemned to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, but God was merciful in educating him to the fact that he must have periods of rest. First, a portion of each day. Second, a portion of each week must be set aside for physical rest. As man would naturally devote his thoughts and energy during the week days to the maintaining of physical life, there must be a time when he should turn his thoughts to his Spiritual life—to the worship of God—that he might not forget his Creator; that he might not forget that he is more than a physical machine; that he might not forget he has an immortal soul. Therefore the Sabbath was made for man. He should always remember that it is the Sabbath of the Lord God. Man should use the Sabbath but not steal it from God. Honor the Sabbath Day. Keep it holy. Do not destroy it. Do not let others destroy it. We are apt to say, "The Sabbath was made for me to do as I please." Remember it was made for men—all men. And all men should so honor it as not to destroy it for any man.

Not long ago there was imported into Dayton, a certain man, an expert in welfare work, who made a speech—such as most of these experts can make. In that speech he advocated Sunday baseball, a municipal dance hall, and a few other things. Then, becoming enthusiastic over his hobby, he took occasion to criticize the church and revivals, which he termed "religious sprees." Then he was kept busy for a week explaining himself. He occupied one of the pulpits at a Sunday service trying to tell the church what it should do to keep abreast of the times. It appears he made a bad matter worse. Also, he was not very sucecssful in explaining himself to the Ministerial Association. The trouble with this man is, he lacks Spiritual vision. Sunday baseball and dance halls are a greater factor with him than the Spiritual welfare of the community. He is one who would lead the people after false gods. There is nothing Scriptural nor logical in this manner of treating the Sabbath. The Scriptural law is a logical law. Take it as you will, it is scientific. The holy Sabbath is a necessary institution. It is a physical, moral, and Spiritual necessity. Judge for yourself whether you had better hearken unto God or hearken unto men.

WHAT DID CHRIST TEACH CONCERNING BAPTISM?

IN discussing this question, it is to be understood that we are raising no argument with respect to forms adopted by various denominations of the orthodox church. So far as we know, the leaders of all denominations agree that the original form was immersion. Other modes were adopted by some as being of more convenient form and considered as sufficient to carry out the spirit of the ordinance. This matter is for the individual conscience to settle. Our argument is with those who do not believe in baptism because they do not believe in the Spiritual life of Christ and consequently do not accept Christ as the Redeemer. Also with that sect which claims to be translated beyond all material forms. We shall discuss the question purely on its merits.

What did Christ teach concerning baptism?

When Jesus came from Galilee to be baptized of John in the Jordan, "John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? Jesus answered, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. 3:14-15). John was preaching a new message, "Repent and be baptized, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." It had never been heard before. It was a message never heard in all the temple worship. The Jews were crowding to the banks of the Jordan to hear the wonderful message. John told them of their evil lives, and called upon them to repent and be baptized. Hundreds accepted the call and were baptized confessing their sins. Then one day Christ came and offered himself for baptism. John at first refused him. Why? Not because he knew that Jesus was the Messiah. John did not know Jesus as the Son of God until after the baptism. We find his own statement to this effect in John 1:33, "And I knew him

not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." This phenomenon did not occur until after the baptism of Jesus. Then why did John feel unworthy to baptize Jesus? In Luke 1:44, we read, when Mary went to salute her cousin Elisabeth, after the holy conception, Elisabeth said, "Lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." This babe was to be John Baptist. There was a psychical influence even at that time. Then in the wilderness it is evident that John had holy visitors who instructed him regarding his work, for he speaks of one who sent him to baptize. There must have been some peculiar sensation while in the presence of these holy visitors. So we may assume that John felt a thrill of some power superior to himself when Jesus approached which caused him to say, "I have need to be baptized of thee." Jesus said, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Note the word "us." He was speaking to John. He meant John and himself. It was necessary for Jesus to be baptized and it was necessary for John to baptize him. John was the one who was to prepare the way. He had been doing this among the people. Jesus must also be prepared for the work which he was about to begin. One preparation for the work was baptism. What, then, did Jesus' baptism signify? What did it mean? What did the baptism of the Jews mean? It meant that they should bury in the water of baptism their old lives, their old customs, old forms of sacrifices, their old ceremonial forms which were merely prophetic of the realization which was now about to take place. They were now to be regenerated and live in the New Dispensation of repentance and redemption. The old man was to be buried and to be raised again to walk in a new life. But Jesus' baptism had a peculiar significance. In fact, his baptism gave to the ordinance its full strength. Jesus came into the world to restore correspondence between man and God.

This involved a renewed revelation of God to man—teaching the Spirit of the kingdom of God—opening a way by which man might regain his Spiritual state. This meant a final sacrifice for sin which would be available to all who would accept it. This sacrifice was to be his own life. This sacrifice typified the complete submission of the human will to the will of God. Jesus had now reached about the age of thirty years. He was now ready to undertake his work. His first act was to take on the vow to do his Father's will to the uttermost. This vow was symbolized in baptism. He laid down his life and he took it again. His death and resurrection were thus portrayed. It was in this that all righteousness would be fulfilled. By this act Jesus promised God that he would obey to the limit. It was then that God called from heaven, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him." It was then that John saw the sign agreed upon by which he recognized the Son of God.

During Jesus' ministry, he often spoke of baptism. He not only said to John that it was necessary for himself to be baptized, but he afterward said that it is necessary for all who would follow him to be baptized.

When Nicodemus came to Jesus to learn more about him and his teachings, he said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Jesus told Nicodemus that it was not sufficient to acknowledge him as a prophet, because of his miracles. If Nicodemus would know about the kingdom of God, there was one thing absolutely necessary. Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Then he said further, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

What did Christ mean by being born of Water? When water is used figuratively in the Bible, it usually symbolizes an abundance of life—the absolute life, namely Spiritual life. For example, we find in John 7: 37-39, "In the last day, that great

day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified)." Isaiah 12:3: "Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation"; that is, draw a new and abundant life from the exhaustless supply of the Messiah's salvation. And John 4:11: "Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water"; that is, Spiritual life. And John 4:14: "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." These references are sufficient to prove our statement. Then to be born of water and of the Spirit, is to be born into a new Spiritual life, the gift of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ.

Jesus follows these statements with the picture of Moses lifting up the serpent in the wilderness, symbolic of his crucifixion, and says, "Even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." Thus Jesus connects his own death and resurrection, and the gift of eternal life, with being born of water. Then Jesus could only have referred to being born anew through the waters of baptism as symbolizing his death and resurrection. Buried in the water—dead to sin; raised again—resurrected to a new and abundant Spiritual life.

Now it must not be considered that baptism is a cleansing process. Of itself, baptism neither cleanses the body nor the soul of sin, as some have supposed. It has no material significance and that is where some have erred. Its significance is wholly Spiritual.

Then again, baptism is not a saving ordinance. There are some who have been baptized who will not enter the kingdom

of heaven. For they have afterward forsaken and traduced the cause which they had at first espoused. They come under that class of whom Christ said, "The last state of that man is worse than the first." On the other hand, there will be some enter the kingdom who have not been baptized. We have for this the example of the thief on the cross, to whom Christ said, "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Yet this is a serious question. We believe that those who wilfully reject baptism, do more than reject the ordinance. They reject the vow for which the ordinance stands. In rejecting that vow they are really rejecting Christ. Yet, there are those who do not see the Light until the last hour when the ordinance of baptism is not practical and, no doubt, such are forgiven.

Paul clearly interprets the ordinance in Romans 6:3-5: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in a newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

To be effective, baptism should be thoroughly understood. We find in Acts 18 and 19 an instance where it was not understood. Apollos, an enthusiastic disciple, not understanding the ordinance, had gone to Ephesus and baptized a number of people in the name of John. When Paul arrived he asked the converts if they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and they answered that they knew nothing about the Holy Ghost. Paul then asked, "Unto what, then, were ye baptized?" And they said, "Unto John's baptism." Then Paul explained that John taught that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ. Then they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Baptism, then, signifies that the candidate confesses his sins, repents of them, dies to his old life, agrees to walk in a

new life; acknowledges the death and resurrection of Christ; and, like Christ, submits his will to the will of God; accepts the vicarious atonement as his hope in the resurrection and as his door into the kingdom of God. Also that he acknowledges the Trinity, for he must be baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Finally, what did Jesus command respecting Baptism?

Matthew 28:19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Mark 16:15: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned." Notice that belief must precede baptism. The disciples accepted this commission and we find them at work in the Book of Acts, preaching and baptizing all who believed and repented. This is true also in their work during Jesus' ministry.

All of this is in accordance with the teachings of Jesus. Do you believe in the teachings of Jesus?

THE LORD'S SUPPER
OR
HOLY COMMUNION

HAVING discussed baptism, the first of two ordinances instituted by Christ, our work would not be complete without a brief discussion of the second, known as the Lord's Supper.

We do not propose to go into all the controversies that have arisen from the doctrines pertaining to this ordinance, which have tended only to mystify it, such as "transubstantiation," "concomitance," "consubstantiation," "transmutation," etc.

We shall appeal directly to the purpose of the ordinance as originally designed by Christ. It was a simple ordinance and we are sure that Christ did not intend it to be surrounded with mystery. It was the last supper of which Jesus partook with his disciples before his crucifixion. It was the Passover supper commemorating the end of the bondage in Egypt—the night when the death angel slew the firstborn of Egypt, but passed over the houses of the Israelites where the blood was sprinkled over the lintels and the door posts. That event which caused Pharaoh to let the Israelites go, had occurred about fifteen hundred years prior to the night when Jesus sat with his disciples to celebrate it for the last time. All during that period, once every year, that event was celebrated in memoriam by the Jews. But this Passover would be the last, for a new supper was about to be ordained. Christ, the true Passover Lamb, was about to be slain that all nations might be liberated from the bondage of sin. It was a sad time, for it was a parting time. It was a sad time because there was a traitor present. It was a sad time for Jesus because he had a terrible burden resting upon him—a burden which, a little later, made him shed great drops of blood in Gethsemane. He talked to his disciples of the coming event during the supper. Then toward the end of

the supper, while they were yet eating, thus blending the prophecy into the fulfillment, "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:26, 29).

Mark's record is verbally the same as Matthew's. Luke adds, "This do in remembrance of me." And Paul, in First Corinthians 11:26, says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

Now we have the story; let us analyze it. Jesus said of the bread, "This is my body." He said of the wine, "This is my blood." The controversies of the past have hinged on the word "is"—"is my body," "is my blood."

As Jesus' body had not yet been broken, nor his blood spilled, and as his body at that time was just as human or material as the body of any other man, it is evident that he did not mean that the bread and wine were literally his flesh and blood, nor that they were similar in substance to his flesh and blood, nor that his Spirit accompanied them. Jesus blessed the bread and wine, just as he gave thanks at any meal, just as he blessed the loaves and fishes when he fed the five thousand.

When Jesus said to the woman of Samaria that he would give her living water, the woman took him literally. Then Jesus said, "Whosoever shall drink of this water shall thirst again; but he that drinketh of the water that I shall give, shall never thirst." Now, we know that Jesus had reference to the Holy Spirit. But he did not mean that the Holy Spirit was really water, nor that the Holy Spirit was to be given in the form of water. He spoke figuratively.

When Jesus said to the Jews (John 6:35), "I am the bread of life," he did not mean literally that he was bread. When he

told his disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, he did not mean literally "leaven bread." Matthew 16:12: "Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees." "Leaven" stood for "doctrine." When Jesus said, "Ye are the salt of the earth," he did not mean that his followers are actually salt. Types were used all through the Jewish religious ceremonies. The Jews were used to thinking in symbols. Jesus constantly taught in symbols. All of his parables were truths represented in symbols. For example, the "Wheat and Tares." Jesus explained that the wheat was the children of God, and the tares, the children of the devil, and the harvest, the end of the world, etc. So, at this supper, Jesus meant that the bread was a symbol of his broken body and the wine a symbol of his spilled blood.

Next we observe that he gave both the bread and the wine to his disciples. They, his followers, were to partake of both—in form—his broken body and spilled blood. Matthew and Mark say, "Drink ye all of it," that is, all of the disciples should drink of it; or as Luke has it, "Divide it among you."

It was intended that all of Jesus' followers were to partake of this supper. It was a ceremony for believers. Paul says (I. Cor. 10:17), "For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread"; (I. Cor. 10:21), "Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils." Those who partake should be one—of one body, Christ Jesus. They should be of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.

But some have erred in remaining away from the Lord's supper, thinking they were unworthy. Paul said, "Whosoever shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (I. Cor. 11:27). This has frightened some because they did not understand the meaning. By reading verses twenty to

twenty-two inclusive, we find that Paul was reprimanding the Corinthians for making a glutinous feast of the Lord's Supper. In verse twenty-nine, he explains that they were unworthy in "not discerning the Lord's body." These Corinthians had not been recognizing the purpose of the Lord's Supper but had turned it into a regular feast and were drinking to excess. They thus profaned the ceremony. The admonition pertains to the manner and spirit in which the ordinance is celebrated and not the moral condition of the believer. That is, no one should stay away because he has sinned, for in that case no one could partake. We should partake as believers, in remembrance of our Lord's death. It is a constant reminder to the world that Christ died for sinners. We who believe and have accepted Christ, should use this means of keeping the fact before the world. "Do it in remembrance of me," said Christ. "This do"—it was a command; and yet it has the ring of a request. It sounds as though Christ said, "This do in remembrance of me—if ye love me." It was in parting—"Remember me—remember my love for you—remember me to the world. Keep my dying love fresh in your memories until I come again." "I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

Thus, as we sit around the Lord's table, we are looking back at his death and at the same time we are looking forward to his coming again—looking forward to the time when we shall partake with Jesus Christ of the supper in our Father's kingdom. What a beautiful thought that we are not worshiping a dead Jesus but a living Christ!—one who is with the Father and who will come again to receive us.

"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come again in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

—*Acts 1:11.*

BENEDICTION

"Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

—*I. Corinthians 13:13.*

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

—*John 15:13.*

"God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

—*Romans 5:8.*

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.

—*Galatians 13:14.*

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: July 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 475 483 9